



THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Princeton, N. J.

v 6-3

6

Case,

Division.....

Shelf,

Section.....

Book,

No. —.....

BS2364

M619

1802

v.2:2





INTRODUCTION
TO THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BY
JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS,
LATE PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN, &c.

TRANSLATED FROM
THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN,
AND
CONSIDERABLY AUGMENTED WITH NOTES,

AND A
DISSERTATION
ON THE
ORIGIN and COMPOSITION
OF THE
THREE FIRST GOSPELS.

BY
HERBERT MARSH, B.D. F.R.S.
FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOL. II. PART II.
CONTAINING THE TRANSLATOR'S NOTES TO THE
SECOND VOLUME.

THE SECOND EDITION.

LONDON,
PRINTED FOR F. AND C. RIVINGTON,
Nº 62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1802.

VOL. II. PART II.

NOTES TO CHAP. VII.	—	PAGE 533
———— CHAP. VIII.	—	— 638
———— CHAP. IX.	—	— 835
———— CHAP. X.	—	— 840
———— CHAP. XI.	—	— 843
———— CHAP. XII.	—	— 844
———— CHAP. XIII.	—	— 889

Printed by Bye and Law, St. John's Square, Clerkenwell.

N O T E S.

C H A P T E R VII.

Critical review of the ancient versions of the New Testament.

S E C T. I.

PAGE I.

1. **I**N the Philosophical Transactions for the year 1699, Vol. xxi. p. 359—365, is an essay entitled A calculation of the credibility of human testimony. This hint has been taken by the learned Knittel, who in his commentary on a fragment of Ulphilas, p. 169—197, has examined by mathematical rules the evidence, for and against the readings of the Greek Testament, and applied for that purpose even Algebraical series.

PAGE 3.

2. Dr. Michaelis, the father of our author, who devoted his whole life to the study of the Polyglot, cautions every collector of various readings not to take them from the Latin translations of the Oriental versions, but he censures not these translations, so highly as our author. *Istæ interpretationes Latinæ sunt, vel ad sensum magis quam ad literas et verba comparatæ, vel suis subinde laborant nævis.*

C. B. Michaelis Tractatio critica de var. lectionibus N. T. § 32.

PAGE 4.

3. See Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca Tom. IV. p. 191—203, and Waltoni Prolegom. v. x. xiii, xiv, xv, xvi. An accurate account of the versions of the Bible, both ancient and modern, is given in Walch's Bibliotheca Theologica, Tom. iv. p. 47—166. But the most complete description, especially of the various editions, is in Le Long's Bibliotheca sacra, ed. Masch, Pars II. Tom. I. II. III. This excellent edition, which is by far the best, was published at Halle in 6 Vols. 4to, 1778—1790.

S E C T. II.

PAGE 4.

1. Dr. Hirt's Orientalische Bibliothek, or Oriental Library, was a periodical publication begun in 1772 and closed in 1773, it was printed at Jena and consists of 8 Vols. 8vo. Extracts will be given from this work whenever our author particularly refers to it.

PAGE 5.

2. The Syriac name **ܥܡܡܐ** signifies not only simplex, but rectus, being derived from **ܥܡܡܐ** extendit. It is probable therefore that the Syrians intended to express, by Peshito, the correct or faithful version.

PAGE 6.

3. Instead of the expressions **ܡܠܝܚܐ** sacerdos, **ܪܝܝܣܐ ܐܚܝܐܪ** or **ܐܝܬܝܡ ܐܚܝܐܪ** princeps sacerdotum, and **ܡܠܝܚܐ** sacerdotium, which are used in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the Arabic version published by Erpenius, the words **ιερευσ**, **αρχιερευσ** and **ιερωσουν** are rendered in the Arabic of the Polyglot by **كهنة**, **كهنة**, and **كهنة** in the epistle to the Hebrews, as well as in the other books of the N. T. When our author says that the sense of sacerdos is not ascribed to **ܡܠܝܚܐ** in the Arabic Lexicons, he must mean those, which were written by native

tive Arabs, for this sense is given it in the Lexicon Heptaglotton.

4. Our author here observes that שָׁמַע when followed by the prefix ב signifies 'to obey.' The direct or oblique government therefore of שָׁמַע is attended with the same distinction, as in the Latin word *ausculto*.

5. The title of this work is, I. D. Michaelis Grammatica Syriaca, Halæ 1784.

PAGE 7.

6. That the Syriac translator of the Epistle to the Hebrews rendered *τοῖς μὲν εἰ σὺ, ἐγὼ σημεῖον γεγεννηκά σε* ch. i. 5. by ܐܢܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ without having recourse to the Syriac version of Psalm ii. 7. is not only possible, as this is the literal and obvious translation of the Greek, but even probable, because the words immediately preceding are ܕܝܟܠܐ ܕܝܟܠܐ dixit Deus, whereas in the passage of the Psalm we find not ܕܝܟܠܐ but ܕܝܟܠܐ dominus.

7. Heb. i. 13. the reading is ܕܝܟܠܐ ܕܝܟܠܐ sub pedibus tuis, Psalm cx. i. ܕܝܟܠܐ ܕܝܟܠܐ pedibus tuis.

8. It is true that the Syriac text Heb. ii. 6—8. is so different from the Syriac text Psalm viii. 5—8. (viz. to the beginning of v. 8.) that they are undoubtedly independent translations. But the reason which our author assigns, for the necessity of a new translation in the epistle to the Hebrews, is not so obvious, for whoever compares the Greek and Syriac texts, Psalm viii. 5—8. will find that they express precisely the same sense, and that the whole difference consists in the difference of the idioms.

PAGE 8.

9. Moses brought with him two manuscripts of the Syriac version. Storr de vers. Syr. p. 19. But these two MSS. were probably not duplicates of the whole Syriac Testament, but only two different volumes, the one containing the Gospels, the other the Acts and the epistles. The former is still preserved in the imperial library at Vienna, and noted Codex Lambecii 258, as

is related by Adler in his *Biblisſch-critiſche Reiſe*, p. 13. Le Long, in his *Bibl. ſacra*, Tom. I. p. 101. ed. Paris. 1723, or P. I. p. 189. ed. Boerner, relates on the authority of Maſius, that it was written at Moſul on the Tigris.

10. Widmanſtad, in the preface to his edition of the Syriac N. T. ſign. a * * * 3, (the pages of the preface are not numbered) relates that he began to learn the rudiments of Syriac in 1529 from Theſeus Ambroſius, a learned civilian, who had been inſtructed in that language by the three Syrian prieſts, Acurius, Moſes, and Helias, who were ſent as deputies from Syria to the Lateran council held under Leo X.

11. In ſupport of the aſſertion that Widmanſtad was aſſiſted by Poſtell, Dr. Hirt appeals to his *Cosmographia*, in præf. ad Imperatorem Ferdinandum, Baſilæ 1561, 4to.

PAGE 9.

12. The edition of Widmanſtad has no date on the title page, which is the reaſon why many of the learned, not excepting Schaaf, were led into error by the date annexed to the arms of the printer. But no doubt can be made that 1555 is the true date, as it is repeated in ſeveral places. 1. The preface addreſſed to the Emperor Ferdinand is ſubſcribed Viennæ Auſtriacæ v. Id. Januar. Anno M.D.LV. 2. The addreſs of the Emperor printed immediately before the Goſpel of St. Matthew is ſigned, Anno a Chriſto nato M.D.LV. 3. At the end of the Goſpel of St. Matthew, fol. 34, we find Viennæ Auſtriacæ xiiii Februarii, Anno xvi^a a Chriſti nativitate ſæculi quinquageſimo quinto. The date 1555 is likewiſe repeated at the beginning and end of the other Goſpels, at the end of the Epiſtles of St. Paul, and of the Acts of the Apoſtles, at the beginning of the Epiſtle of St. James, and laſtly at the end of the volume is, Ad hunc exitum perductum eſt divinum hoc opus anno a Chriſti nativitate M.D.LV. xxvii. Septembris. In thoſe copies, in which the arms of the printer are not ſtamped, the reverse of the title-leaf is a blank page.

13. The

13. The German title of this work is *Nachricht von einer Hallischen Bibliothek*. It was a periodical publication by Dr. Baumgarten, printed between the years 1748 and 1751, in eight vols. 8vo. But the account there given of the Widmanstad edition, is not so accurate, as that given by Dr. Hirt.

14. The account given by Dr. Hirt of the Widmanstad edition of the Syriac N. T. is in his *Orientalische Bibliothek*, Vol. II. p. 260—288. Vol. III. p. 257—268. Vol. IV. p. 317—341, and Vol. V. p. 25—40. In the second of these places the description is critical, in the other three chiefly historical: but as the nature of the subject hardly admits an extract, and a translation of the whole would swell these notes to a disproportionate size, I must confine the description to the few following particulars. The first six lines of the title page are Syriac, in the Estrangelo character, the two last of which are printed in smaller letters. They are immediately followed by the Latin translation *Liber sacrosancti Evangelii de Jesu Christo Domino et Deo nostro. Reliqua hoc codice comprehensa pagina proxima indicabit*. Under this translation is *Div. Ferdinandi Rom. Imperatoris designati jussu et liberalitate, characteribus et lingua Syra Jesu Christo, vernacula, divino ipsius ore consecrata, et Johanne Evangelista Hebraica dicta scriptorio prelo diligenter expressa*. At the bottom of the page is another line in the Estrangelo character, with the Latin translation, *Principium sapientiae timor Domini*. The work is handsomely printed in quarto. At the end of this Syriac N. T. (that is, immediately after the first epistle of St. John, the two last epistles with that of St. Jude, and the book of Revelation, as well as the second epistle of St. Peter, making no part of the Syrian canon) are two tables of lessons, the one from the Gospels, the other from the epistles, appointed to be read in the Syrian church on Sundays and holy days throughout the whole year. Lastly, the two celebrated passages John vii. 53—viii. 11. and 1 John v. 7. are wanting. This rare and valuable edition therefore may be considered as a perfect pat-

tern of the genuine Peshito, which cannot be said of any subsequent edition. This is likewise confirmed by Adler in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, who after having described eight MSS. of the old Syriac version says, p. 19. In paucis quæ evolvi locis nullam ab editione Viennensi discrepantiam reperi. The origin and progress of this edition may be seen at length in *Le Long Bibliotheca sacra*, ed. Masch, Pars II. Vol. I. p. 71—79.

15. This catalogue of Errata is printed at the end of the Preface, immediately before the Gospel of St. Matthew, and contains only those, which had been made in the four Gospels. With respect to the various readings printed in the midst of these Errata, Widmanstad himself in the page immediately preceding them makes the following remark, *Propter pauca quædam loca inter typographicas emendationes notata hoc signo **, in quibus libri Syrorum a nostris discrepant, vel ob historiam adulteræ apud Johannem, quod et in Græcis exemplaribus non infrequens est, prætermissem, opus totum per calumniam ne reprehendito. Bruns observes that Widmanstad could mean by nostris libris only Greek and Latin MSS. or editions; that the passages which are not in his edition have been found in no manuscript of the Syriac version, and that when admitted into later editions, they have either been translated into Syriac by the editors themselves, or copied from more modern Syriac versions, by which means the genuine Peshito has been disfigured. The differences of which Widmanstad speaks are omissions in the following verses: Matth. x. 8. xxvii. 35. Luke xxii. 17, 18. and the omission of the story of the adulteress, John viii. 1—11. It may be likewise remarked that a list of Errata is likewise printed immediately before the epistles of St. Paul, none of which is marked with an asterisk: but before the three catholic epistles is no list either of errata or various readings. Widmanstad therefore thought no apology necessary for the omission of 1 John v. 7.

16. Mulleri *Symbolæ Syriacæ* were printed in 1673, 4to: but the work is very difficult to be procured.

17. These

17. These four texts are printed in parallel columns, so that they form a kind of Polyglot.

PAGE 10.

18. This charge is made by Simon in his *Histoire critique des versions du N. T.* ch. 14. where a description is given of the edition of Tremellius. But Dr. Hirt, who has examined with great accuracy the editions of the Syriac version, asserts in his *Orient. Bibl.* Vol. II. p. 191. that the charge is ungrounded. Besides, Professor Bruns, in his essay on the editions of the Syriac version (*Repertorium*, Vol. XV. p. 158.) observes that Tremellius frequently quotes, in the margin of his edition, the Heidelberg MS. by name, and that in almost every book of the New Testament. He produces likewise examples, in which Tremellius has deviated from the text of Widmanstad, on the authority of this MS. and relates that at the end of the work is a list of passages, to which Tremellius prefixed the following superscription, *Loci quidam in quorum scripturâ partim peccarunt operæ, partim codex Viennensis ex Heidelbergensi est emendandus.* That this manuscript was brought from Heidelberg to Rome, where it is at present preserved in the Vatican, is related by Le Long in his *Bibliotheca sacra*, T. I. p. 184. ed. Boerner. or Tom. I. p. 99. ed. Paris. 1723. Müller, in his dissertation on the Syriac version, p. 40. relates on the authority of Rutgher Spey, that it was at that time nine hundred years old.

19. *Repertorium*, Vol. XV. p. 157.

20. That Tremellius used Hebrew instead of Syriac characters was rather a matter of necessity than choice, as no Syriac types at that time existed, except those of the Imperial printing house in Vienna. Hirt's *Or. Bibl.* Vol. II. p. 294.

21. To the notes which have been already taken from this part of Hirt's *Or. Bibl.* may be added, that in the edition of Tremellius those books are omitted, which are not in the edition of Widmanstad. Likewise John vii. 35.—viii. 11. and 1 John v. 7. though with this difference,

rence, that Tremellius has left a vacant space for these passages, in the former of which he has the following note, *Vacat hæc pagina quod historia de adultera in interpretatione Syriaca non exstat*: in the latter, *Totum septimum versiculum Syrum Testamentum omittit, sicut etiam multi Græci codices, qui ita restitui posset*. He then takes the liberty to subjoin his own Syriac translation of this verse, which subsequent editors have inserted in the text, as a part of the genuine Peshito. In other instances Tremellius has departed from the text of the Vienna edition, when supported by the authority of the Heidelberg manuscript. (*Repertorium*, XV. 158.) And even without the authority of any Syriac MS. he has made alterations in *Matth. x. 8.* and *Luke xxii. 17, 18.* (*Repertorium*, XV. 156, 157.) For a further description of this edition of Tremellius, see *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 408.

22. By the *Biblia Regia*, our author understands the Antwerp Polyglot, published in 1569—1572, in 8 vols. folio, of which a description is given in *Le Long's Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 340—349. See also P. II. Vol. I. p. 83, 84.

23. This is related by Simon in his *Hist. crit. des vers. du N. T. ch. 14.* and he adds that Postell procured it for Bomberg. It is probably, therefore, the same as that which is known under the name of the *Codex Colonienfis*, from which Rapheling selected various readings. This MS. consists of two volumes; the first contains the four Gospels, and forms of prayer to be used in the ceremony of baptism: the second contains the Acts, the first epistle of St. James, the first of St. Peter, and the first of St. John, and lastly, the fourteen epistles of St. Paul in the usual order. The subscription at the end of the MS. is partly effaced, so that the year, in which it was written, cannot be determined: but in a Latin note added by Postell, is said, *In lingua Christi hoc est Syriaca hoc volumen scriptum anno Alexandri 1500.* For this information I am indebted to Professor Paulus. This manuscript was afterwards purchased by N. Heinsius,

N. Heinsius, from whose hands it came into the Bibliotheca Colbertina. See Le Long's Bibliotheca sacra, Tom. I. p. 99. ed. Paris. 1723, or ed. Boerner, Lipsiæ 1709, P. I. p. 188. At present it is preserved in the University Library at Leyden, where it is marked Num. 1198. See p. 410. N^o. 26. of the Leyden Catalogue, published in 1716, folio.

PAGE II.

24. Textus Syriacus ex editione Widmanstadii Viennæ 1555 emissâ exscriptus cum MSto. Colonienfi est collatus.

Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 348.

25. No MS. of the Peshito has been discovered in which this verse is found, though in the Amsterdam MS. (which is however of no authority, it being written in 1700) it is added in the margin. See Adler's Versiones Syriacæ, p. 33. This excellent work was published at Copenhagen in 1789, 4to. A collation of this Antwerp edition, with that of Widmanstad, is given in Hirt's Or. Bibl. Vol. V. p. 245—260. Vol. VI. p. 453—484. Vol. VII. p. 267—270. and Vol. VIII. p. 443—465. under the title Collatio Widmanstadii cum bibliis Regiis Antwerpiensibus.

PAGE 12.

26. It is most probable that the octavo Antwerp edition of the Syriac N. T. was intended as a continuation of Plantin's Hebrew Bible, printed in 1573 and 1574, because it has no title-page, the only superscription being דְּיִתְקָא חֲדָתָא, printed over the first chapter of St. Matthew, and is of the same octavo size, and printed with the same types. See Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 80.

27. This Codex Viennensis is nothing more than the Vienna edition, published by Widmanstad, as I have been informed by Professor Paulus, who has examined the copy of the Antwerp octavo edition in the Weimar library. It is interleaved, and on the blank pages a former

former proprietor of this copy has noted several, but not all the readings, in which the Vienna and Antwerp editions differ, annexing to them sometimes the word *Austriacum*, at other times *Viennense*. Its critical value therefore is not so great as our author conjectures. Professor Paulus likewise mentioned that this copy has no title-page, which confirms the account given in the preceding note.

28. Dr. Hirt quotes here the title of this scarce edition. *Novum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum, Syriace, Antwerpiae ex officina Christophori Plantini Architypographi Regii M.D.LXXV.* He observes, that the same books and passages are wanting, as in the preceding Antwerp editions, and that beside the 380 pages of text, there are seven leaves of various readings collected by Rapheling from the Cologne MS. As I am in possession of this edition, as well as that of Widmanstad, I will add, that the Latin title is preceded by a Syriac title in Hebrew letters *רִיתִיקָא חֲרֵתָא*, that the various readings occupy not seven leaves, but nineteen pages, and that Nun, the Syriac prefix to the 3^d. Fut. is not changed into Jod, as in the edition of Tremellius.

29. The Syriac text in the Paris edition of 1584, is printed, like the Antwerp editions, in Hebrew letters without points.

30. To prevent mistakes, it is necessary to observe, that the person whom our author here calls *Le Fevre*, is the very same *Guido Fabricius de la Boderie* mentioned N^o. 3. His French name was *Guy le Fevre de la Boderie*. A description of this edition may be seen in *Le Long Bibliotheca sacra*, ed. *Masch*, P. I. p. 410.

PAGE 14.

31. See *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. *Masch*, P. I. p. 391. and P. II. Vol. I. p. 84.

32. Professor *Bruns* here observes, that even the errors of the press, which had been noted by *Tremellius*, were transferred from his edition to that of *Hutter*. From many

many examples, he has selected the following, Matth. xiii. 23. xvi. 21. xx. 23. xxvi. 55. 61.

33. Polyglotta Londin. Tom. VI. p. 51—56.

34. See Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 82. A list of readings, in which the editions of Trost and Plantin differ from that of Widmanstad, is given by Hirt, in his Orient. Bibl. Vol. III. p. 259—268.

PAGE 15.

35. For a description of this MS. see Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 97. It was afterwards deposited in the University Library at Leyden, where it is marked N° 18. among Scaliger's manuscripts. Vid. Catalogum bibliothecæ publicæ academiciæ Lugduno-Batavæ, p. 405.

36. This work was printed at Leyden in 1648, 4to: and re-printed at Amsterdam, with additions from the author's manuscript in 1693, fol. The date therefore assigned by our author must be an erratum.

37. Pococke made use of only one Syriac manuscript, which he found in the Bodleian library, as appears from the title, Epistolæ quatuor, Petri secunda, Johannis secunda et tertia, et Judæ fratris Jacobi una: ex celeberrimæ bibliothecæ Bodleianæ Oxoniensis manuscripto exemplari nunc primum depromptæ, et charactere Hebræo, versione latina notisque quibusdam insignitæ. Opera et studio Edvardi Pococke, Angli-Oxonienfis. Lugduni Batavorum, 1630, 4to. In the first page of the preface he describes this manuscript in the following manner, Continebat eas pulcherrimum exemplar MS. bibliothecæ Bodleianæ, una cum Actis Apostolorum, et Epistolis cæteris catholicis, eo ordine, quo in Græcis solent codicibus, dispositæ. This manuscript is probably that which is now marked in the Bodleian library A, 2909, 126, and described by Uri in his Catalogue of the Bodleian MSS. p. 5. N°. 19. among the Syriac manuscripts: for this is the only Syriac manuscript in the Bodleian library, which corresponds to Pococke's description. A mistake which Le Long had made in regard

gard to this MS. is rectified by Ridley, sect. 12. N°. 14. Namely, Le Long had asserted that the manuscript, from which Pococke printed the four catholic epistles, was preserved in the library of Bishop Moore, which library was afterwards purchased by George I. for the University of Cambridge. On which Ridley remarks, ‘*Cantabrigiam profectus hunc codicem pervolvi, quem pessime descriptum deprehendi: non Philoxenianam, sed Simplicem exhibet versionem, juxta hunc igitur non prodierunt quatuor quæ defunt epistolæ canonicæ studio Cel. Pocockii; et non quatuor tantum istas sed omnes septem epistolas canonicas ibi frustra quæsisseris.*’ This manuscript is now marked in the University Library of Cambridge Ff. 2. 15. I have been informed by Professor Paulus, that among the MSS. formerly in the possession of Dr. Pococke, is a perfectly fresh copy of these four Syriac catholic epistles written in Hebrew letters, which he supposes to be a transcript, which the learned editor had made for his own use in the publication of the work: and this conjecture of the learned Professor is confirmed by what Pococke himself says in the second page of his epistle dedicatory, ‘*Perlegebam avide has epistolas; inde nec transcribere tam suo, quam Ebræo vocalibus ad Syrorum normam ornato charactere, gravatus sum.*’

38. See rather Le Long *Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 96, 97.

39. See Walchii *Bibliotheca theologica*, Tom. IV. p. 170. and Waltoni *Prolegomena*, p. 89.

40. For that reason, in Widmanstad’s edition, which may be considered as a copy of the manuscript sent to Europe by the Syrian Patriarch, the words are not pointed throughout.

PAGE 16.

41. With respect to this passage, we find in the London Polyglot, Vol. V. p. 440. the following remark. *Tota hæc pericope sequens in omnibus exemplaribus Syriacis adhuc editis deest, quam ex instructissima Reverendissimi*

verendissimi Præfulis J. Usseri Archiep. Armachani bibliotheca depromptam exhibemus. Since that time, no one has ever heard of this manuscript of Ap. Usher, nor is it enumerated in the Catalogue of Usher's manuscripts, printed in the *Catalogi MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti*, Tom. II. P. II. p. 16—48.; but it must have been one of the later copies of the Philoxenian version, in which the story of the adulteress is added in the margin. For I have collated the Syriac text, John viii. 1—11. as printed in the London Polyglot, from Ap Usher's MS.; with the text of the Paris manuscript of the Philoxenian version, printed in Adler's *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 57. and found that the six first verses agree, word for word, and letter for letter, and that in the following verses are only four trifling differences in single words. I have likewise collated the text of this passage in the London Polyglot, with that of the Codex Barfalibæi, printed in White's edition of the Philoxenian version, Tom. I. p. 559. and here again found so remarkable a coincidence, as to leave no room for doubt, that all three MSS. contain the text of one and the same translation of this passage. The editors therefore of the London Polyglot have printed, as a part of the old Syriac version, a passage which is found only in the later copies of the new. It is wanting not only in the Peshito, but in the genuine copies of the Philoxenian (Adler's *Vers. Syr.* p. 55.) and was added in the latter as a marginal scholion, the translation being ascribed in Ridley's Codex Barfalibæi to Mar Abba, in the Paris manuscript to one Paul a monk. It may however be remarked, that the passage is found in the *Versio Syra Hierosolymitana*, which will be described in the sequel.

42. A description of it may be seen in *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 86.

PAGE 17.

43. Dr. Hirt, in his *Or. Bibl.* Vol. II. p. 321. says that those copies belong to the genuine edition corrected by Gutbier himself, in which the figures, prefixed to the verses

verses in the Gospel of St. Matthew, are smaller than in the other Gospels, and that those, in which the figures are of equal size, are a re-impression. I have a copy of this edition, which, according to the preceding criterion, is the genuine, which has not only a Latin title-page, with the date 1664, but likewise a copper-plate engraved by Iselburg, and adorned with various figures, in the middle of which is a Syriac, as well as a Latin title, with the date 1663. Perhaps this is likewise a mark of the genuine edition.

44. See *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 81.

45. *Prodiit Novum Testamentum Schaafianum jam anno 1708, et ipsa præfatio Kal. Martii ejusdem anni data est, quapropter editionem ad annum præcedentem retulimus, dum prima exemplaria annum 1708 in fronte ostendunt. Frequentiora sunt ejusdem editionis exemplaria, quibus novus titulus 1709 præmissus est. Editio secunda Lugduni 1717 priori emendatior et auctior.*

{ *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch,
 { P. II. Tom. I. p. 89, 90.

PAGE 18.

46. To the editions of the Syriac New Testament enumerated by our author, may be added, *Novum Testamentum Syriacum et Arabicum*, Romæ 1703, Tom. II. folio. It was published by the Propaganda, for the use of the Maronite Christians in Syria, but it is probably of no value to a critic.

S E C T. III.

PAGE 19.

1. Our author here means Dr. Ridley's Codex 3, or Codex Barſalibæi, which he has described in the 13th. and 14th. sections of his *Differtatio de versionibus Syriacis*.

2. These examples were communicated by Dr. Ridley
 to

to our author; but a more complete catalogue of instances not only from the Acts, but also from the epistles of St. Paul, may be seen in the 14th. section of his *Diff. de vers. Syriacis*. He has produced none from the Gospels, because these are the Philoxenian version, and cannot therefore be applied with so much propriety, in correcting the printed text of the Peshito.

3. Our author is not accurate in saying that ܐܠܠܗܐ is used for *πᾶσι λεγω*, for it is the translation of *πᾶσι* alone, *λεγω* being rendered by ܐܡܪ, and it seems to be immaterial in the present instance, whether for *πᾶσι* we read ܐܠܠܗܐ ‘*omnibus vobis*,’ or ܐܠܠܗܐ ‘*omnibus illis*.’

4. Acts i. 12.

5. Our author is mistaken in saying that *κοινωνια*, Acts ii. 42. is translated by ܡܫܚܝܬܐ, for *κοινωνια* is translated by no substantive, but is expressed in the participle ܡܫܚܝܬܐ ‘*communicantes*,’ and ܡܫܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܝܬܐ is the translation of *τῇ κλάσει τῶν ἁγίων*.

6. Our author can mean only in comparison with the author of the Philoxenian version.

7. The Erpenian Arabic, like the old Syriac translator, has expressed *κοινωνια* by no substantive whatsoever, and it is here likewise implied in the verb ܡܫܚܝܬܐ. Our author’s argument therefore is not only without force, but devoid of meaning.* His intention is to shew that ܡܫܚܝܬܐ, Acts ii. 42. is not the word that was used by the old Syriac translator, but the result of a modern scholion: the argument for this opinion may be stated in the following manner. In the Syriac version, for *τῇ κλάσει τῶν ἁγίων*, the printed text is ܡܫܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܝܬܐ, ‘*in fractione eucharistiæ*;

but the Erpenian Arabic translator, who translated the Acts immediately from the Syriac, has simply ܡܫܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܝܬܐ, ‘*in fractione panis*.’ It is probable therefore that the genuine reading, which the Arabic translator found in the Syriac, was some word simply expressive of bread, such as ܡܫܚܝܬܐ, for instance, the usual translation of *ἄρτος*. This seems to be the clearest

clearest statement; but the argument is at best of little weight, as the word *εὐχαριστία*, though adopted in the Syriac, does not appear to have been ever adopted in Arabic. (Lex. Hept. p. 58.) The Arabic translator therefore could not have used it, even had he found it in the Syriac version. That 'eucharistia' had not acquired the sense of the modern word 'Eucharist' in the time of the Syriac translator, depends on the age in which he lived, and we may rather apply this very word, to which no critical objection can be made, as an argument that the old Syriac version was not made in the first, or even before the middle of the second century, than, presupposing its high antiquity, condemn the word as spurious.

8. That the Erpenian Arabic translator has used a phrase expressive of Corpus Christi, and not *خبز* 'panis,' which is found in the same passage in the Arabic of the Polyglot, is rather a proof that he actually found *لحم المسيح* in his copy of the Syriac version, than simply *لحم* 'panis,' which he has usually translated by *خبز*.

PAGE 20.

9. *أليس له ابن* is not necessarily an interrogation, for though rendered in the London Polyglot 'quomodo autem dixit?' it may with equal propriety be rendered 'quemadmodum autem dixit.' See Schaaf's Lex. Syr. in voce *أليس*. Nor is it an argument, that the Arabic translator has used *كَيْفَ قَالَ*, for *كَيْفَ* is used both affirmatively and interrogatively. Lex. Hept. p. 1720.

10. Perhaps this is an erratum for *أكبر* 'superbia.'

PAGE 21.

11. This task has been in some measure executed by Professor Adler, in the first part of his *Versiones Syriacæ, Simplex, Philoxeniana, et Hierosolymitana*. Hafniæ, 1789, 4to. But as this learned writer has mentioned those MSS. only which he had himself examined, the catalogue might be augmented by many others. Le Long,
in

in his *Bibliotheca sacra*, Tom. I. p. 98—102. ed. Paris. 1723, or ed. Boerner, P. I. p. 183—192. has also mentioned several Syriac manuscripts of the New Testament. The Syriac manuscripts of the N. T. preserved in the different libraries of England and Ireland, are described in the *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti*, Oxoniæ 1697, fol. Those which are preserved in the Bodleian library are described in the following work. *Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ codicum manuscriptorum orientalium, vid. Hebraicorum, Chaldaicorum, Syriacorum, Æthiopicorum, Arabicorum, Persicorum, Turcicorum, Copticorumque catalogus, jussu curatorum præli academici a Joanne Uri confectus. Pars prima*, Oxonii 1737, folio. Those in the royal library in Paris are described in the first volume of the *Catalogus Codicum MStorum Bibliothecæ Regiæ, Parisiis* 1739—1744, 4 tom. folio. The manuscripts in the Vatican and Medicean libraries are described in the catalogues published by the Assëmani, the one printed at Rome in 1756, in 3 vols. folio, the other at Florence in 1742, folio. The Vienna manuscripts are described by Lambecius, in his *Commentaria de augustissima Bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonensi*, in eight books or volumes, folio, printed at Vienna in 1665—1679, and re-printed with considerable additions by Kollar in 1766—1782. The Leyden manuscripts are described in the *Catalogus librorum tum impressorum quam MStorum Bibliothecæ Lugduno-Batavæ*. Lugduni apud Batavos 1716, folio: and in the Supplement printed in 1741, folio.

PAGE 23.

12. The arrangement is the same as in our canon, except that the three catholic epistles of St. James, St. Peter, and St. John, (the other four, with the book of Revelation, being not admitted, at least in the time of Ebed Jesu) are placed before those of St. Paul. But Widmanstad has a different arrangement, the three catholic epistles being printed at the end, and those of St. Paul before the Acts of the Apostles, in the same manner as in Wetstein's Greek Testament.

S E C T. IV.

PAGE 23.

1. Bengel's remark, with respect to the Syriac version, is the following, *Coptica versio et Syriaca valde inter se, et cum Latinis congruunt: ambæ autem pernultis in locis Græcos codices a Latinis desertos ita sequuntur, ut fere pro immediatis haberi mereantur.* Our author's reference to p. 409. of the *Introductio in crisin N. T.* is perhaps an erratum, for this treatise, as printed in the second edition of Bengel's *Apparatus criticus*, has only eighty pages. It is there p. 44.

S E C T. V.

PAGE 24.

1. See Note 8 to chap. vi. sect. 10.

PAGE 25.

2. See Griesbach's *Symbolæ criticæ*, p. ix.

PAGE 27.

3. That one of the old Latin versions was made by a native Syrian, seems highly improbable. See Note 1 to the following section, and the Notes to the twenty-fourth section of this chapter.

4. See Michaelis *Curæ in Versionem Syriacum Act. Apost.* p. 175. compared with Note 1. to sect. 29. of this chapter.

5. This is what Griesbach calls *Recensio Constantinopolitana*, and is the model, after which our common printed editions have been regulated.

PAGE 28.

6. A modern manuscript of the Syriac New Testament, written in the East Indies in 1700, and sent by the Bishop of Malabar to Schaaf the editor of the Syriac Testament,

Testament, is now preserved in the library belonging to the Gymnasium in Amsterdam. See Adler's *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 31.

S E C T. VI.

PAGE 29.

1. Our author here alludes to his hypothesis, that one of the old Latin versions was made by a native Syrian, that this Latin version was made at the end of the first century, and that this Syro-Latin translator had recourse in different passages to the version of his own country. Hence it follows, that the Syriac version of the N. T. was made before the expiration of the first century. But the premises themselves rest on very unstable ground, for, 1. It is improbable that a native Syrian would undertake the task of a Latin translator, and still more improbable that the Latin translation of a foreigner should have been received in a country, where Latin was the native language. 2. It is impossible to shew with any colour of argument, that even the oldest Latin translations, such as those for instance contained in the Codd. Vercellensis and Veronensis, published by Blanchini, were made in the first century.

2. The necessity of a Syriac translation in the first century is not so obvious as our author contends, for in all the great cities of Syria Greek was at that time the current language. But if we admit the usefulness of such a translation, we must not conclude a *posse ad esse*; for on the very same principles we might infer, that the Anglo-saxon version was made in the same century in which Austin the monk introduced the Christian religion into England, a version which its most zealous advocates place no higher than the year 700. Besides, it is a matter of fact, though frequently denied, that in the early ages of Christianity, as well as in the later times of the Roman hierarchy, not all the books of the New Testament were permitted to be read indiscriminately by the laity in general; and as most of the Syrian priests in the

two first centuries understood Greek, a translation was unnecessary.

PAGE 30.

3. It is well known that the works of Melito no longer exist, if we except a few detached fragments preserved by Eusebius in the 4th. book of his Ecclesiastical History, and his evidence for the antiquity of the Peshito rests on the authority of the following scholion, printed in the Roman edition of the Septuagint, Gen. xxii. 13. and there ascribed to Melito. *Ο Συρος και ο Εβραϊος κρημαμενος φησιν, ως σαφεστερον τυπην τον ζαυρον.* Now admitting this scholion to be genuine, which is however a matter of doubt, does it follow that *ο Συρος* denotes the Peshito? Nay, it is impossible that the Peshito can be meant; for this version, Gen. xxii. 13. has a word not expressive of *κρημαμενος*, but of *κατεχομενος*, the reading of the Septuagint. But the scholion is probably spurious, and written long after the death of Melito; for when the Greek fathers quote *ο Συρος*, they understood not the Syriac version, but a work written in the fifth century. See Döderlein's essay, entitled, *Quis sit ο Συρος Veteris Testamenti interpres*, published at Altdorf in 1772. After all, were the scholion genuine, and the old Syriac version intended to be expressed, the only inference that could be deduced would be, that the Syriac version of the Pentateuch existed before the close of the second century.

4. Our author here quotes Beausobre Hist. du Manichéisme, without referring to either volume, chapter, or page. But as he quotes it in support of the opinion that Manes was ignorant of Greek; he has acted prudently in not specifying the place, since Beausobre entertains a directly contrary opinion, which he supports by very good arguments. See his Hist. de Manichée et du Manichéisme, Tom. I. p. 95. The argument therefore for the antiquity of the Syriac version, drawn from the pretended ignorance of Manes, falls to the ground.

5. But as the same Syrian tradition, which refers the version of the New Testament to the first century, refers that of the Old Testament to the age of Solomon, it
affords

affords at least a presumption, that one part of the tradition is as fabulous as the other.

PAGE 31.

6. This argument shews only, that the Syriac version existed before the middle of the fourth century.

PAGE 32.

7. The foregoing arguments prove nothing; for these four catholic epistles, with the book of Revelation, were even in later ages not admitted into the canon of the Syrian church, as appears from the list of canonical books given by Ebed Jesu who died in 1318. (Assemani Bib. Or. Tom. III. P. I. p. 8). The Peshito therefore would contain precisely the same books, whether made in the first, or the fourteenth century. Nor were they contained in the manuscript, which the Syrian Patriarchs sent to be printed in Europe, and from which Widmanstad's edition was taken.

8. This proves only that the Syriac translator understood his original, and that he made a proper distinction between the language of the primitive, and that of the hierarchical church.

9. This argument affords only a presumption that the Syriac version was made before the seventh century, when the irruption of the Saracens extirpated the Syriac, and introduced the Arabic in its stead.

10. See Ridley de vers. Syr. sect. 7. and Storr de vers. Syr. sect. 2—9.

11. The complete edition of the works of Ephrem was published at Rome in 1732—1747. in 6 vols. folio, under the following title, *Sancti Patris nostri Ephraem Syri Opera omnia quæ extant Græce, Syriace, et Latine.* The first volume of his Syriac works is the fourth volume of the whole work, and contains Ephrem's commentaries on the Pentateuch, and the historical books of the Old Testament; but he has interspersed a great number of quotations from the Syriac version of the N. T. It is necessary to observe, that among our author's references are several errata, for neither p. 37 nor 395 contain

quotations from the New Testament, and for Matth. xxii. 40. Ephes. ii. 19. and Luke i. 78. must be read Luke vi. 31. Ephes. ii. 11, 12, 13. and Luke i. 71.

PAGE 33.

12. That the old Syriac version is quoted by Ephrem, no one will deny. It is certain therefore that it existed in the fourth century, but as Ephrem is the oldest evidence, that can be produced, of its antiquity, it must remain a matter of uncertainty, whether it was made one, two, or three centuries previous to that period. And it is surely better to confess our ignorance on a subject, where we can arrive at no certainty, than subscribe to the fabulous legends of the Syrians. *Sed detur hæc venia antiquitati.*

The arguments hitherto alleged in these notes, with respect to the antiquity of the Syriac version, are merely negative, and shew only the invalidity of those arguments, which our author produces in favour of the hypothesis, that the Syriac version was made in the first century. But positive reasons may be advanced, which shew the hypothesis to be wholly ungrounded. No man could think of translating the Greek Testament, before its several parts were collected and united in a volume, or which is the same thing, before the sacred canon was formed. Now the ancient legend, that the canon was formed at Ephesus before the close of the first century, has been long rejected as unsupported by any authority whatsoever, and various writers, especially Griesbach in his *Historia textus epistolarum Paulinarum*, Sect. 2. § 12, and Semler in his *Commentarii historici de antiquo Christianorum statu*. Tom. I. p. 35—39. have shewn that the canon was not formed before the middle of the second century. Previous to that period therefore the Syriac version cannot possibly have existed.

S E C T. VII.

PAGE 33.

1. This answer is not perfectly satisfactory. The word in question is printed in the Widmanstad edition, not as our author has written it, but ܩܘܥܝܢܐ. Now it is well known that the Widmanstad edition is an exact representation of the Syriac MS. from which it was printed, and that only those words are pointed, in which doubt might arise, in the same manner as in the Syriac manuscripts. But Quoph has here a Revotzo, the first syllable therefore was designed to express not Cus but Ques: and even if we admit that Rish is a mistake for Dolath, how shall we account for the insertion of the Nun, if ܩܘܥܝܢܐ is the word intended to be expressed? It seems therefore more reasonable to conclude, that quæstionarius* is the word actually meant by the old Syriac translator; for ܩܘܥܝܢܐ, as written in the Philoxenian version, has a totally different orthography from the word used in the Peshito. Besides, in the Philoxenian version Matth. xxvii. 65. ܩܘܥܝܢܐ is marked with an asterisk, that refers to ܩܘܥܝܢܐ written in the margin, which leads to the conclusion, that Thomas of Harkel altered here the reading of the former version, on the authority of the Greek MSS. with which he collated it. (See White's edition, p. 153.) Nor is it necessary to adopt the hypothesis of Simon, in order to rescue the antiquity of the Syriac version, for Vossius was totally mistaken in saying in the place, to which our author refers, 'Infimæ Latinitatis reperiuntur vocabula, quale est quod occurrit, Matth. xxvii. 65.' Quæstionarius is not infimæ, but mediæ latinitatis; it is used by Jerom in his Commentary on Joel ch. ii. and though he is the first author, in whose works it is actually found, there is no necessity for sup-

M m 4

posing

* As pointed in Widmanstad's edition, the word expresses 'quæstionarii' in the plural, on account of the Ribbui, which is an additional argument that the singular noun 'custodia' was not meant: at least, that the person who added the Ribbui did not take it in that sense, if it was not added by the translator himself.

posing that the word itself was not in common use before the fourth century, at least in the age, in which the Syriac version was written, which we have no reason to refer to so early a period as the first century. With respect to the meaning and application of the word *quæstionarius* in the Syriac version, see Note 4 to ch. iv. sect. 10.

PAGE 34.

2. ܡܥܬܝܬܐ is a pure Syriac word derived from ܡܥܬܝܬܐ *posuit*, *thesaurizavit*. Lex. Hept. p. 2490.

3. ܡܥܬܝܬܐ is literally *laves*.

4. ܡܥܬܝܬܐ is literally *Aramæi*.

5. Dr. Mill, in the place to which our author refers, does not make the objection himself, but mentions it as an objection, that might be made, and gives the very same answer, which our author himself uses in this Introduction.

PAGE 38.

5. The objections to the antiquity of the Peshito have been very properly answered by our author in this section: but we are still left in the same state of uncertainty how many years it was made before the time of Ephrem.

6. But no one will contend that the subscription at the end of the four Gospels in the Philoxenian version is a translation from the Greek, yet the name of the Bishop of Mabug is there written, not according to Oriental orthography, but is simply Greek in Syriac letters ܡܡܝܬܐ ܡܡܝܬܐ. Bar Hebræus, an original historian, writes it in the same manner, *Affemani Bib. Orient. Tom. II. p. 411.*

7. Our author's *Grammatica Syriaca* was published at Halle in 1784. In the *Orient. Bib.* he has produced the very same example which he has here given, viz. ܡܡܝܬܐ.

S E C T. VIII.

PAGE 39.

1. It is true, that in the Latin translation of the Syriac version ܡܡܝܬܐ, 1 Cor. vii. 2. is rendered *teneat*, but it is probable

probable that the Syriac translator intended nothing more than a literal translation of *ἐχέτω*, as *ܐܠ* signifies, not only tenuit, but cepit, and habuit.

2. If it was the intention of the Syriac translator to strengthen the expression of St. Paul, in order to recommend a state of celibacy, as our author conjectures, he has defeated his own purpose by using a word expressive of weakness, for if the recommendation of celibacy betrays weakness, the contrary inference must be deduced. But it is probable that the Syriac translator intended to express by *ܡܠܟܘܬܐ*: 1 Cor. vii. 6. what St. Paul meant by *κατὰ συγγνωμην*, namely ‘unsupported by divine command,’ in opposition to *κατ’ ἐπιταγην*.

3. It is probable that the Syriac translator found this, either as scholion in the margin of the Greek manuscript, from which he translated, or even in the text itself, for Chrysostom quotes 1 Cor. vii. 7. in the following manner: *Θελω γὰρ πάντας ἀνδρῶνες εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτὸν ἐν ἐγκρατείᾳ.* (Chrysostomi Opera, Tom. X. p. 160. ed. Montfaucon.) This circumstance is unfavourable to the high antiquity of the Syriac version, though on the other hand it is possible that *ܡܠܟܘܬܐ* itself was obtruded on the Syriac text, long after the version was made.

4. Yet it appears from the title prefixed to the Gospel of St. Matthew, in a manuscript of the Persic version, which formerly belonged to Dr. Pococke, that the Persians at the time at least, when that manuscript was written, believed that St. Matthew’s Gospel was translated into Syriac at Antioch. See Wheloc’s edition of the Persic version, in the page immediately preceding the second title-page. The Latin translation of this Persic title is, *Evangelium Matthæi, quod in urbe Palæstinæ lingua Hebraica dictum est, Antiochiæ vero Syriace conscriptum.*

PAGE 40.

5. Griesbach is of a very different opinion. See his *Historia textus epistolarum Paulinarum*, Sect. I. § 12.

PAGE

PAGE 41.

6. It is true, that Θεε μου, Σεε μου, ινατι με εγκατελιπες, the Greek translation of Eli, Eli, lama fabaſthani, is not rendered by the Syriac translator Matth. xxvii. 46. but in the parallel paſſage, Mark xv. 34. the Greek translation is re-translated into Syriac.

PAGE 42.

7. See also the Notes 41—51. to that ſection.

8. Our author's conjecture receives additional force from the circumſtance, that the Syriac translator has even departed from the Greek text, and expreſſed, not της σφουδας αυτης, but της σφουδας σου.

PAGE 43.

9. ܠܝܢܝܢ signifies exaudivit, reſpondit, opitulatus eſt.

10. Bethphage is mentioned only three times in the N. T. and in theſe three inſtances not the leaſt notice is taken of its diſtance from Jeruſalem. There is no neceſſity therefore for aſcribing to Bethphage a ſenſe, of which it is incapable, for though ܠܝܢܝܢ might ſignify a valley, or a road between two mountains, like the Arabic وادي, yet ܠܝܢܝܢ ܠܝܢܝܢ can have no other meaning than 'the habitation of the valley.'

11. ܠܝܢܝܢ signifies convenit and has no particular reference to the conflux of waters. Beſides not this word, but ܠܝܢܝܢ corresponds to the Syriac ܠܝܢܝܢ, which ſignifies 1. opprobrium. 2. miſericordia.

PAGE 45.

12. The Syriac translator, for 24 εſτι Κυριακον δειπνον φαγειν 1 Cor. xi. 20. expreſſes, non, ſicut juſtum eſt die Domini, comeditis et bibitis.

13. Schaaf's translation is generally eſteemed correct.

S E C T. IX.

PAGE 46.

1. Griefbach, in the Preface to his Greek Teſtament, p. 14. ſays, Verſio Syriaca ad juniores codices e variis reſenſionibus interpolatos reſicta minoris pretii eſt quam multis videtur,

PAGE 48.

2. This appears from the very preface to the Pseudocritica Millio-Bengeliana. The omissions therefore which our author supplies at the end of this section are not to be considered as faults.

PAGE 49.

3. But ἀναθαρτος is rendered in these two passages by two different words.

4. See Blanchini Evangeliarium quadruplex, P. II. p. 315. The Codex Vercellensis is here defective.

PAGE 50.

5. The Cod. Cant. has *ἐκτεινας τὴν χεῖρα κρατήσας ἡγειρεν αὐτήν*.

6. Evangeliarum quadruplex, P. II. p. 319.

7. But even in Widmanstad's edition, fol. 38. ܠܢܐ in this passage, though in other respects unpointed, is written with a Ribbui over the Nun. The plural therefore was intended to be expressed in the original MS. from which he took his edition, and the mark, by which it is denoted, is to be ascribed to the Syrians themselves, not to the punctuation of modern editors.

8. Namely, the Codex Vercellensis, Mark ii. 1. has Cum introisset iterum in Capharnaum post dies, cognitum est, quod in domo esset. Evangel. quadr. P. II. p. 320.

9. Namely, the Syriac version has ܠܠܐܠܐ, the Brixianus has inter quatuor.

10. The Cod. Cant. is quoted for διὰτὶ by Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach, but the Cod. Stephani β is not quoted by the two last mentioned critics, on the supposition that this MS. is the very same with that, which Beza presented to the University of Cambridge.

S E C T. X.

PAGE 51.

1. See Ridley de vers. Syriacis, sect. 10.

2. Unde factum est, ut cum Syri articulo emphatico careant, qui Græcorum articulo præpositivo ο, η, το respondet

spondeat, quem Hebræi per suum ה exprimunt felicissime, hic noster, potius quam ut emphasin articuli Græci omiserit, pronomen tertiæ personæ οὗ passim substituerit, quod alioqui proprie valet *εχεινος* vel *αυτος*.

Ludov. de Dieu Præf. in Apocal. Syr.

PAGE 52.

3. As if *μεσσερυνημα* were compounded of *μεσος*, *μεσα*, and *αιμα*, as Ridley has observed.

4. The erratum is not to be ascribed to the writer of the MS. but to the editor de Dieu. In the MS. itself it is written ܠܘܬܝܢܝܬ, which de Dieu copied without observing the point under the Dolath, and concluded therefore that the Ribbui, which merely denotes the plural, included also the point of a Rish. For this information I am indebted to Professor Paulus, who has examined this manuscript in the University Library at Leyden. He likewise mentioned that it is very neatly written on silk paper, in the modern round Syriac character. It is marked N°. 18. among Scaliger's MSS. See p. 405. of the Leyden Catalogue, published in 1716. folio.

5. It is extraordinary that our author, who was educated in Halle, and whose father was Professor there above fifty years, should be able to give no further account of this MS. of the Syrian liturgy. On the supposition, that a knowledge of it might lead to some discoveries with respect to Scaliger's MS. from which de Dieu printed his edition, I have made the necessary inquiries, and am indebted for the following information to Professor Eberhard, and Dr. Schulze. It is actually in the library of the Orphan-house, and preserved not among the Syriac, but the Chaldee manuscripts, because it relates to the forms of Baptism, according to the Chaldee ritual. It is of the octavo size, very neatly written on vellum, in the modern round Syriac character, has on the first page a Syriac title, written partly in red and partly in black ink, consisting of thirteen lines, (two of which have been erased) which import merely the contents of the work. On the following page is a Latin title

title ab antiquâ manu, namely, Ordo Baptizandi juxta ritum Chaldæorum lingua Chaldaicâ, jussu Ill^{mi}, et Rev^{mi} D. Julii Antonii Sanctorii tituli S^{ti} Bartholomæi in insula S. R. E. presbyteri Card^{lis} descriptus per Gaspar de Malavar Indum, servum olim deinde familiarem et diaconum Rev^{mi} D. Haaman Ignatii, olim Patriarchæ Jacobitarum, unum ex præceptoribus linguæ Chaldææ et Arabicæ in Collegio Neophytorum. Romæ mense Julii M.D.LXXX. The MS. therefore is very modern, and was written not in the East, but in Rome, and Caspar, or Gaspar, though a native of India, was one of the transcribers employed by the Propaganda. If therefore the Leyden MS. from which our common editions of the Syriac Revelation have derived their origin, was written by the same person, as there is reason to suppose, from the coincidence of the name and country of the copyist, Scaliger's manuscript must have been brought not from the East, but from Italy. See the following Note 7.

PAGE 53.

6. A Syriac catalogue of the works of Mar Aba, printed in Assemani Bib. Orient. Tom. III. P. I. p. 75. seems unfavourable to this conjecture; for though it is there said that Mar Abba translated the Old Testament from Greek into Syriac, and wrote commentaries on several of the epistles, yet no mention is made of a translation from any book of the New Testament. On the other hand Asséman quotes (Tom. II. p. 412.) a passage from an Arabic writer, who says that Mar Abba translated both the Old and the New Testament. No copies however of this version have been hitherto discovered, unless Scaliger's MS. of the Revelation, published by de Dieu, be considered as a fragment of it.

7. Codex anno 1582, Romæ descriptus ab autographo pervetusto ab ipso, ut perhibetur, Thoma Heracleensi exarato anno 622. Ridley de Vers. Syr. sect. 12. See also Adler's Vers. Syr. p. 78. who has there printed a specimen of this MS. and adds omnino eundem exhibet

con-

contextum qui in editionibus nostris typis expressus legitur. It follows therefore that Scaliger's MS. and the Florence MS. contain the text of one and the same version. But if we go a step further, and conclude from the subscription of the Florence MS. that they contain a part of the Philoxenian version, we involve ourselves in a difficulty, which Adler himself has felt, who contends that the style of the Philoxenian version is very different from that of the Revelation in the two above-mentioned manuscripts. Now all that the subscription of the Florence MS. imports is, that it was copied from an Autograph which Thomas had written with his own hand. This he might have done, though it were not translated by Polycarp, the author of the other books of the Philoxenian version; and the subscription, though it mentions the transcriber, leaves us wholly in the dark with respect to the translator. On the other hand, if the subscription imports that Thomas was not only the transcriber, but the translator, it is not extraordinary that the style of his translation should be different from that of Polycarp; and in that case we must make a distinction between the Philoxenian, and the Heracleian version. There is the following passage in Pococke's preface to his edition of the four catholic epistles, *Unum monere liceat Dionysium quendam (ita se vocat) qui commentariis Syris has una cum cæteris canonicis, et Actis Apostolorum, necnon Apocalypsi illustravit, in præfatione ad secundam Petri monere 'Epistolam secundam Petri non fuisse versam in linguam Syram cum libris, qui diebus antiquis redditi sunt; ideoque non inveniri, nisi in translatione Thomæ Episcopi, qui cognominatus est Heracleensis secundum nomen Heracleæ civitatis suæ.'* But after all the subscription itself is extremely suspicious; the autograph, from which the Florence MS. was copied, no longer exists, we have no other authority than the bare word of the copyist, and his veracity is at least dubious, since Ridley's Codex Heracleensis contains even the four catholic epistles which are wanting in the Peshito, but not the

the Revelation, whence it is reasonable to conclude that this book was never published by Thomas of Harkel.

PAGE 54.

8. Professor Adler, on the contrary, in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 78. says of the printed Syriac version of the Revelation, *A genio Philoxenianæ versionis tantum differt, quantum a simplice. Accusativum quidem ut Philoxenus per Δ præfixum exprimit, sed tot Græcis verbis civitatem, vel potius peregrinitatem non dedit; vocēs vel phrasēs origine Syriacas Syriace reddidit, nulla superflua explicatione addita, ut cap. i. 8. conf. vers. Philox. Matth. xxvii. 46. Marc. v. 41. xiv. 36. verba composita non expressit ut συγκαινωνος, cap. i. 9. ἰσχυρῶς, conf. Philox. συλλυπημένος, Marc. iii. 5. ἐκφοβοί, ix. 6. et alia multa, nomine propria more Syrorum non ad Græcorum pronuntiationem scripsit, verbo, literis non tam anxie inhæsit quam Philoxenus. Statuimus hanc Apocalypſeos versionem ab alio quidem quam versio Syriaca vulgata Evangeliorum factam esse, sed Philoxenum auctorem non agnoscere.*

9. It is to be hoped that the curiosity of the learned will shortly be gratified, by the completion of Professor White's edition of the Codex Heracleensis. It will then appear, whether the Syriac version of the four catholic epistles wanting in the Peshito, which was published by Pococke, from a MS. in the Bodleian library, has the same text as the MS. of Ridley.

Since the first edition of these Notes was printed, Dr. White has published the Philoxenian version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles. Another volume containing the Epistles of St. Paul is shortly expected.

PAGE 55.

10. This is a necessary consequence, if the four catholic epistles, published by Pococke, and since admitted into the Syriac Testament, are no part of the Philoxenian version.

11. Dr.

11. Dr. Hassencamp's Remarks on our author's Introduction to the N. T., which relate only to the latter part of the first edition, were published at Marburg in 1767, under the following title, *Anmerkungen über die letzten Paragraphen des Herrn Hofrath Michaelis Einleitung ins N. T.* In the 34th. and 35th. pages, to which our author refers, Dr. Hassencamp quotes one example from the Syriac works, and five from the Greek works of Ephrem, in which different passages are introduced by the Syrian father from the second epistle of St. Peter; p. 42. he relates, that in Ephrem's Commentary on Genesis (Vol. I. p. 136. of his Syriac works) are expressions which appear to have been borrowed from the epistle of St. Jude, and that in the 3^d. vol. of his Greek works the whole epistle of St. Jude is inserted. Now it must be observed, that the object of Dr. Hassencamp was merely to shew that the four catholic epistles, which were not admitted into the Peshito, were still acknowledged as divine by the Syrian fathers. But the present question in our author's Introduction relates to a totally different subject, namely, whether a Syriac version of these four epistles existed in the time of Ephrem; and this question remains wholly undecided. For though it appears that the Peshito existed in the time of Ephrem; because his Syriac quotations correspond with it, yet, as no other Syriac quotation has been produced from his works, in which a passage from these four epistles is alleged, than ܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ, 2 Pet. iii. 10. and even this short passage differs from the printed text, we can only conclude that he copied not from our present version, but we are left wholly in the dark, whether in quoting he translated for himself, or copied from some version already made. The Greek quotations decide nothing in the present question, for they shew only that the original was known to Ephrem. See Assemani *Bibl. Orient.* Tom. I. p. 44.

12. This inference is wholly ungrounded, for the existence of a Syriac version of the four catholic epistles is by no means necessary to procure them the title *ܡܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ*.
The

The passage in the Greek works of Ephrem, to which our author refers in the note, (where it must be observed that he means the Roman, not the Oxford edition) is, λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, μείζονα τὰς ἐκ ἐχὼ χαρὰν, ἵνα ἀκρωτὰ ἑμὰ τέκνα περιπατήσῃα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, where Ephrem quotes the fourth verse of the third epistle of St. John, which agrees with our printed text of the Greek Testament, except that the latter, instead of μείζονα τὰς has μείζοτεράν τῶν. It follows therefore, that the Syrian father acknowledged the third epistle of St. John to be a part of holy scripture: but for the inference, that this epistle was already translated into Syriac, there seems to be no foundation, unless it could be shewn that Ephrem was unable to quote from the original, the contrary of which is known to be true. If it be argued, that an epistle, dignified by a Syrian father with the title ἡ γραφή, though not admitted into the canon of that church, would hardly have remained untranslated till the end of the fourth century, it may be answered, that no one will deny its possibility, or even probability, but evidence must be produced before it can be asserted as a fact.

13. By Philoxenian, our author here means the common printed text of the Revelation, but it appears from Note 8, that it is at least a matter of doubt whether this title can with propriety be applied to it.

14. ܣܠܬܐ signifies ‘sermo, oratio,’ without any reference to metre. But Asséman, in his *Bibl. Orient.* Tom. I. p. 59. speaking of the compositions of Ephrem, quotes an Arabic passage relative to this subject, in which the correspondent word مبامر is used, and which he translates ‘carmina.’

15. Dr. Hassencamp has here again, in his *Remarks*, p. 7—11. quoted from the works of Ephrem passages relative to the book of Revelation, with the same view as he had quoted passages relating to the four catholic epistles: but he draws no inference whatsoever with respect to the existence of a Syriac version of the Revelation in the time of Ephrem, nor from these premises

alone can any such inference be deduced. For it appears only that Ephrem was acquainted with the book of Revelation, not that he had a Syriac version before his eyes; and the same remarks, which were made in Note 11, are applicable in the present instance. The oldest writer, of whom it can be positively affirmed that he quoted from a Syriac version of the Revelation, is Jacob of Edessa, whose quotation will be examined at large at the end of this section; but how many years it was written before his time, we have at present not sufficient data to determine. Perhaps if the Syriac works of Ephrem were examined with more attention; some light might be thrown on a subject, which is now obscure.

PAGE 56.

16. This quotation begins in the middle of the third verse, ends before the close of the sixth, and only the latter half of the fourth verse is quoted. I have copied, not from the transcript in our author's Introduction, in which are several errata, but from the Syriac works of Ephrem, and the original edition of de Dieu. The letters, which are printed with the Syriac text in reference to the notes, are placed at the end of each word to be noted, but in our author's German edition the marks of reference are placed in some cases before, in others after the word to be noted, which creates no small confusion. It is necessary to observe, that our author, in comparing the quotation of Jacob with the text of the same passage as it stands in the edition of de Dieu, presupposes throughout, that the latter is a part of the Philoxenian version, and this very hypothesis has led him to the supposed discovery of what he calls Philoxenian precision in some cases, where no such precision is visible. Those who adopt a different hypothesis, must for the term 'Philoxenian precision,' substitute 'precision of the author of the version published by de Dieu;' but it must be at the same time remarked, that Professor Adler, in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 79. absolutely denies that the same anxious exactness, which the author of the Philoxenian

Philoxenian version betrays, is visible, at least in so high a degree, in the Syriac printed text of the Revelation.

17. In the sixth verse Lomad is likewise prefixed to {ΛΔ} in the quotation of Jacob, it is therefore no distinguishing mark of the version published by de Dieu. But it does not appear to be an instance of precision, since {ΛΔ} corresponds more precisely to the Greek, than {ΛΔΔ}, though Lomad is frequently used in the Philoxenian version, as well as in the version of the Revelation, to denote the accusative. With respect to αὐτοῖς ‘omnino,’ which our author says is added paraphrastically, though it is difficult to comprehend in what the paraphrase consists, it is necessary to observe, that not only this word, but likewise the words {ΔΑΔ} {ΔΑΔΔ}, are peculiar to the quotation of Jacob, at least in this particular position, though our author has inserted them in the same part of the passage quoted from de Dieu. But I have omitted them in the copy of the printed text, as making no part of the third verse, for they are found in that part of the fourth verse, which is here not quoted, and are the translation of *νεχρυσωμενη χρυσω*. It seems then, that Jacob quoted from memory, as he has inserted in the third verse, a phrase which belongs to the fourth; and this very circumstance is favourable to Storr’s hypothesis, though the learned critic has not observed it himself.

18. It is true that *καθημαι* is translated by *ω*; ‘equitavit’ in the old Syriac version, John xii. 15. but ver. 14. *καθιζω* is translated by *ωΔ*, the very word, which is used in the printed text of the Revelation, and which our author censures as not being so good a translation as the word used by Jacob.

PAGE 57.

19. 'Inter oculos' is in Syriac ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ, and ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ signifies rather 'domicilium oculorum,' though ܐܝܢܐ is frequently written contracted ܐܝܢ, as Gen. i. 4.

PAGE 58.

20. But if Jacob quoted from memory, as appears from Note 17, a perfect coincidence is not to be expected; and the foregoing inquiry leaves the question undecided.

21. It is true that these words are in the text of de Dieu, but they are not in the position which corresponds to their place in the quotation of Jacob, who has them in the third verse, whereas in the text of de Dieu they are in that part of the fourth verse, which is not quoted here. Our author has inserted them in the third verse, but as this is not warranted by the text of de Dieu, I have omitted them.

S E C T. XI.

PAGE 58.

1. Chorepiscopus, της χωρας επισκοπος. See Mosheim *de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum* M. p. 137.

PAGE 60.

2. To prevent mistakes, it is necessary to observe that Ridley received from Amida, or as it is at present called Diarbekr, four manuscripts, the second and third of which, according to his arrangement, are copies of the Syriac New Testament. His Codex 2, or Codex Heracleensis, contains the Philoxenian version throughout, and is that which was collated by Wetstein, and published by White. His Codex 3, or Codex Barsabæi, has the text of the Philoxenian version in the Gospels, though with additions not found in the original Philoxenian: but in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the epistles, it has the text of the Peshito. This is what our author means by Ridley's second manuscript.

3. An extract from this part of our author's Or. Bibl. is unnecessary, because he himself has given it at the end of this section. But as he has not quoted all the examples, they will be supplied occasionally in these notes.

4. Professor Adler's description of the Roman manuscripts of the Philoxenian version may be seen in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 59—74.

5. The only copy of the Syriac subscription to the Philoxenian version, which had been at that time published, was in Assëmani Bibl. Orient. Tom. II. p. 93. and in the third plate, annexed to p. 541. of the first part of Blanchini Evangeliarum quadruplex, where a fac simile is given of this subscription as written in the Codex Angelicus, though a Latin translation of the subscription of the Florence MS. had been published by Le Long in his Bibl. sacra. That the Latin translations, which had been published by Assëman, Wettstein and Storr, differed from each other, is by no means extraordinary, since they translated from the subscriptions of different MSS. in which the Syriac text itself varies; Assëman from the Codex Angelicus (Bibl. Or. Tom. II. p. 95.) Wettstein from the Codex Heracleensis (Prol. p. 112.) and Storr from the Codex Parisinus (De Verf. Syr. p. 44.) The Syriac text of the first and third of these MSS. as also of the Codex Assëmanianus I, is printed in Adler's Versiones Syriacæ, p. 45—47. that of the second is here printed by our author from the Oxford edition. He has annexed to it a German translation, but I have substituted Wettstein's Latin translation, because the latter, if we except a single word, which is not warranted by the original, and which I have therefore omitted, adheres more closely to the Syriac than our author's German translation. I have likewise inserted the translation of ܠܡܢܝܚܐ, and of the last clause, which Wettstein had omitted as having no immediate reference to the history of the Philoxenian version. But there is one expression

in the last part of the subscription, which I own I do not understand, namely ܡܠܠܠ ܠܚܝܬܐ, which Wetstein translates, ‘anno noningentesimo vicesimo septimo,’ and in this translation he is followed both by Dr. White and our author. Now whether ܡܠܠܠ is an erratum in White’s edition, or not, I will not pretend to determine; but instead of this word, other MSS. of the Philoxenian version have ܡܠܠܠ ܠܚܝܬܐ ܠܚܝܬܐ, which is literally ‘noningentesimus vicesimus septimus.’ See Adler’s *Verf. Syr.* p. 46. It is probably however *not* an erratum, as it signifies in numerals the same thing, namely 927.

6. A description of these three manuscripts is given by Adler, who calls them Codd. Assëmaniani, 1, 2, 3. in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 63, 64. 76. Of the second he says, *Omnibus, quos laudavi, codicibus præstat codex Evangeliorum Assëmanianus 2.* But of the third, he says that they are mistaken, who suppose it to be Philoxenian, for it contains the text of the Peshito, and the error has been occasioned by the absurdity of the transcriber, who has annexed to the old Syriac version the subscription of the new, which he has at the same time strangely altered and perverted. To prevent mistakes, it may not be improper to add, that in several dissertations on the Philoxenian version, in that for instance written by Professor Storr, and published in the seventh volume of the *Repertorium*, the very best which has hitherto appeared, these three MSS. are quoted by the title *Codices xi. xiv, xv.* because they were thus noted in the library of Joseph Simon Assëman, who bequeathed them to Evodius Assëman, as appears from the account communicated to White, p. 641. 645. 648. of his edition of the Philoxenian version. But by Evodius Assëman they must again have been differently numbered, for Adler, who examined them in his library, says of the first, ‘*adseruabatur inter codices Syriacos Assëmanianos numero ix.*’ of the second, ‘*numero x.*’ unless we suppose that there is an erratum in one of the two accounts. Where they

they have been deposited since the death of Evodius Assēman is unknown.

PAGE 62.

7. For that reason Adler, p. 47. suspects them to be spurious. It may be likewise remarked as a peculiarity in the Codex Angelicus, which our author has not noted, that the date 819. of Alexander is there omitted.

8. Professor Storr conjectures (Repertorium, Vol. VII. p. 14.) that the genuine reading is 'duo exemplaria Græca,' as found in the Cod. Ridl. Par. and Assēman. 1. that 'tria' was noted in the margin of the subscription in the Assēman, 1. by some critic, who had observed the following note in the Phil. vers. Matth. xxviii. 5. relative to the word Nazarene. 'In tribus exemplaribus Græcis et uno Syriaco, antiquo illo, non inventum est nomen Nazarenum,' (p. 154. of White's edition) and that hence, in later transcripts, 'tria' was inserted in the text of the subscription, as in the Codd. Angel. Assēman. 2, 3.

9. The first explanation of Assēman seems to be the best, for according to the latter, there is not only a tautology, but a very forced construction.

PAGE 63.

10. The Paris MS. has $\text{H}\alpha\epsilon$, but Adler, p. 48. says of this whole passage, 'Hæc verba additamenta esse quis non sentit?'

11. This conjecture is founded on the following passage in the description communicated to White by Evodius Assēman, (p. 647.) 'Ad calcem evangelii S. Johannis calligraphus describit epigraphen Thomæ Heraclensis, quam in præcedenti codice retuli.' But as the word $\omega\omega\lambda$ is in some MSS. retained, in others omitted, this general assertion of Assēman, that the two MSS. have the same subscription, leads to no positive conclusion, with respect to the word $\omega\omega\lambda$ in particular. Unfortunately we are deprived of the means of determining the question, for since the time that Assēman wrote this

letter, not only the subscription, but the latter part of St. John's Gospel, from chap. xviii. to the end, has either been stolen from this MS. or by some accident has been lost. See Adler's *Verf. Syr.* p. 65.

12. I have here taken the liberty, for our author's German translation, and a part of the Syriac text, which he has so intermixed with the translation as to create confusion, to substitute the Latin version of Evodius Affeman, printed in White's edition of the Philoxenian version, p. 649. The last part of the subscription, which was not communicated by Affeman, may be seen in Adler's *Verf. Syr.* p. 77.

PAGE 64.

13. This remark implies that the edition of Thomas, and that of the year 616, were two different editions, the improbability of which will appear from Note 23.

PAGE 65.

14. For an account of these marginal readings, see Storr de *Verf. Syriacis*, sect. 25. 28. and Adler's *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 79. Whether all the marginal notes proceeded from Thomas, or whether many of them are not to be ascribed to a later critic, or critics, is a subject, on which the learned are still divided. The use of the obeli and asterisks, which Thomas appears to have adopted from Origen's Hexapla, is described in White's Preface to the Philoxenian version, § 6. This learned writer is of opinion, that they were designed to shew the difference between the Philoxenian text and the Greek MSS. with which it was collated. Wetstein and Storr, on the contrary, suppose that they were intended to point out the difference between the new and the old Syriac versions. All three agree in the opinion, that the readings in the text, marked with asterisks, were taken from Greek MSS., but to this Professor Adler objects, (*Biblisch-critische Reise*, p. 107.) and relates that readings are very frequently marked with asterisks, where it is expressly said that they are not in Greek MSS. He
add,

adds, that they are used in so indiscriminate a manner, as to make it difficult to determine their real design. At present however (in 1801) the reader may consult Dr. White's *Præmonitio de asteriscis et obelis in codice Rideliano usurpatis*, which is prefixed to his edition of the Philoxenian version of the Acts and the Catholic Epistles.

15. This Syriac word our author, with Wetstein, and most other German writers, expresses in European characters by Charkel, because *ch* in German, has nearly the same guttural sound as *ܫ* in Syriac. Ridley has imitated Wetstein, as being unacquainted with the German pronunciation, but as *ch*, when pronounced by an Englishman, has not the least similarity to the Syriac Heth, which the Germans express by Cheth, I have written the word Harkel, in the same manner as Asselman has followed the Italian orthography, and written it Harchel. The Latin word adopted by Asselman, and received by subsequent Latin writers to express the Syriac *ܫܪܟܠܝܐ*, by no means corresponds to the Syriac name, which ought to be expressed in Latin by Harcelea, and the adjective should be written not Heracleensis, but Harcelensis, or contracted Harclensis, as Adler has written it. Besides, the word Heraclea is attended with this very material inconvenience, that most readers are led by it into the error of supposing it to be a city called by the Greeks *Ηρακλεια*, whereas it was a paltry town or village in the East, of which the Greeks had no knowledge.

16. See Assemani *Bibl. Orient.* Tom. II. p. 91. Not. 1.

17. This word is written in Syriac *ܫܪܟܠܝܐ*, Assemani *Bibl. Orient.* Tom. II. p. 92. but he says, p. 91. *Syris hodie ܫܪܟܠܝܐ et ܫܪܟܠܝܐ appellatur.*

18. For that very reason he cannot have been the new editor of the Philoxenian version, since a contemporary of Philoxenus would hardly have undertaken a new edition of a version just published.

19. That

19. That Assēman had really historical evidence on his side, appears from the following passage of Bar Hebræus, quoted in *Bibl. Orient.* Tom. II. p. 334. Sub hæc tempora (scil. anno Græcorum 927, vel Christi 616) Thomas Heracleensis cœnobii Taril monachus, qui a puero in Kenferinenſi monasterio literis Græcis excultus postea Mabugi episcopus fuit, exagitatus autem a Domitio Melitenſi in Ægyptum profectus est, habitavitque in Anton Alexandria, in sacro Antoniarum monasterio, ubi memorabili diligentia sacrum Evangeliorum codicem, et reliquos Novi Testamenti libros admodum exacta et accurata emendatione restituit, post primam versionem Philoxeni Mabugenſis studio elaboratam. This account of Bar Hebræus, who was undoubtedly the very best historian the Syrians ever had, agrees so exactly with the subscription of the Philoxenian version in the copies now extant, that there seems no longer room for doubt. To the testimony of Bar Hebræus, may be added the evidence of an anonymous Syriac writer, quoted by Assēman in his *Bibl. Orient.* Tom. II. p. 90, 91. who confounds indeed, in his relation, the cities of Germanicia and Mabug, but expressly asserts that the Thomas of Harkel, who corrected and published the Philoxenian version, lived in a century subsequent to the age of Philoxenus. We must conclude therefore, that the bishop of the name of Thomas, who was alive in the year 533, and died at Samosata, had no connexion whatsoever with the new edition of the Philoxenian version.

PAGE 66.

20. For the sake of perspicuity, it is necessary to transcribe the whole passage which Assēman has quoted from Bar Hebræus. Atque hi characteres sunt ætatis Thomæ Heracleensis, qui primam Novi Testamenti versionem a Mar Philoxeno Mabugenſi elaboratam emendavit. Verum annus quo Aba ordinatus est, nimirum sub Chosroe Anuscervano octo supra septuaginta annis præcedit eum, quo Biblia in Anton Alexandria a Thoma emendata sunt,

sunt, videlicet Græcorum nongentesimum vigesimum septimum. Alius igitur fortasse extitit Thomas doctor, ante Thomam Heracleensem. Assemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. II. p. 411. This account again confirms what was related in the preceding note, and there is no contradiction or difficulty whatsoever. For it is evident that Mar Aba was not a contemporary of Thomas of Harkel, and it is the more extraordinary that our author should confound the preceptor of Mar Aba with the editor of the Philoxenian version, as the former is expressly called, in the page above quoted, Thomas quidam Jacobita.

21. Here our author seems to have misunderstood Professor Storr, for though this learned writer is of opinion that not all the marginal readings are to be ascribed to Thomas of Harkel, yet he assumes not two different editions, one by Thomas, another in 616, for he maintains that they are one and the same. Hanc versionem Syriacam sæculo sexto factam, et *sequenti* a Thoma Heracleensi cum codicibus Græcis comparatam, &c.

Storr de vers. Syr. sect. 22.

22. See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 113.

23. It appears from the foregoing description, that our author assumes four editions of the Philoxenian version. 1. The original edition of the version made by Polycarp, under the patronage of Philoxenus in the year 508. 2. The edition by Thomas of Harkel, who collated it with Greek manuscripts at Alexandria. 3. The edition of 616, likewise at Alexandria, of which the editor is not mentioned. 4. The edition of Barsalibæus in the twelfth century.

Other critics on the contrary contend, that what are here called the 2^d. and 3^d. editions, are in fact one and the same. The question may be best determined by a proper explanation of the above-quoted subscription to this version. The first edition is clearly distinguished from the second by the words, 'Collatus fuit postea a me Thoma.' The third likewise seems to be distinguished from the second by the words, 'Iterum scriptus est et collatus in loco dicto anno 927 Alexandri (616 Christi).'

But

But as no date is annexed to the second part of the subscription, in which mention is made of the collation of Thomas, it is possible, and even probable, that the date 616 refers not only to the time, in which the transcripts were taken, but likewise to the time, in which the editor Thomas lived. This conjecture derives additional force from the circumstance, that the transcripts were made at Alexandria, where the Syriac language was unknown, and where copies would not have been taken of the Syriac version, but on some such extraordinary occasion as that of the residence of Thomas of Harkel in that city, with a view of collating Greek manuscripts. Instead, therefore, of translating the word ܐܠܝܢ by 'iterum,' the whole subscription would become intelligible if we translated it by 'porro;' and it is certainly capable of this sense, because the correspondent Chaldee word ܐܠܝܢ, signifies not only iterum, but amplius, and ulterius. A word expressive of porro, has a very proper reference to ܐܠܝܢ 'primum,' in the first part of the subscription, which applies to the original translator, and to ܐܠܝܢ 'postea,' in the second, which relates to the new editor Thomas, whereas if ܐܠܝܢ be supposed to refer to a third editor, and be explained 'iterum,' or 'secunda vice,' it seems to involve a contradiction. But, setting this argument aside, it cannot be denied that the words ܐܠܝܢ ܐܠܝܢ admit at least the sense of 'porro scriptus est,' and in that sense they will have reference not to a new editor, but to the transcriber who was charged with taking copies of the edition of Thomas; and 'collatus est,' which is not followed by 'exemplaribus Græcis,' as in the second part of the subscription, can have no reference to a new collation, but relates merely to the comparison of each copy, which the transcriber had taken, with the original delivered to him by the editor, in order to correct the errata. That this explanation is agreeable to the truth, is probable, because it removes every difficulty: but the following considerations put the matter out of doubt. In the sentence immediately following the date 616, the writer speaks in the first person, 'quantam

tam molestiam habuerim : he speaks also in the first person in the second part, *collatus est a me Thoma,* whereas the account given in the first part, relative to the original translator, is delivered in the third person. It necessarily follows therefore, that *collatus est a me Thoma,* and *quantam molestiam habuerim,* refer to one and the same person, and that the whole subscription was written by Thomas himself: for had it been composed by a later editor, he would have used the third person in speaking of Thomas, as well as in speaking of Philoxenus. If it be still objected, that the whole may be a composition of two different subscriptions, that of Thomas ending with the words *monasterio sancto Antoniano,* and that of the new editor beginning with *Porro scriptus est et collatus,* we may reply, 1. That a new editor would have mentioned his own name, which he could have done, if really an editor, with the same propriety as Thomas. 2. That he would probably have retained the whole of the subscription written by the former editor. But the third part of the subscription contains no new name, and the subscription written by Thomas could hardly have ended with *monasterio sancto Antoniano,* for in that case there would have failed, what was seldom omitted in subscriptions of this kind, both the date and the usual benediction.

It seems then that there are only two editions of the Philoxenian version. 1. The original translation as it proceeded from the hands of Polycarp in the year 508. 2. As revised, corrected, and re-published at Alexandria by Thomas of Harkel in 616. The single copy of the four Gospels, with the alterations of Barfalibæus in the twelfth century, is hardly entitled to the name of a new edition. All the manuscripts, which have the above-mentioned subscription, belong of course to the second edition; but as the Codex Florentinus, described by Adler in his *Vers. Syriacæ*, p. 52—55. has neither this subscription, nor the marginal readings, it is perhaps a copy of the first edition. It may be likewise remarked, as Adler says of this manuscript *contextus ab Harklenfi recensione*

recensione parum differre videtur,' that Thomas of Harkel acted probably in his edition of the new Syriac version, as Griesbach has done in his edition of the Greek Testament, altering the text in those cases only where it was manifestly erroneous, and referring the other readings to the margin.

A catalogue of manuscripts of the Philoxenian version is given by Ridley, *De vers. Syr. sect. 12.* and he has described his own manuscripts *sect. 13.* Storr has described the Paris manuscript in his *Dissertation de vers. Syr. sect. 23—29.* and the Bodleian manuscript *sect. 30—32.* It is described also in Uri's Catalogue, N°. 16. among the Syriac manuscripts. A very accurate and critical description of Italian, and other manuscripts of this version, is given by Adler in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 52—79. who has at the same time corrected several mistakes in Ridley's catalogue. Professor Paulus likewise published at Helmstadt, in 1788, a small pamphlet, entitled, *Accuratio manuscriptorum, quibus versio N.T. Philoxeniana continetur, catalogus, cum quibusdam ad viros eruditos quæstionibus.* But though every one must be curious to read what is written by so learned an author, the pamphlet is so scarce, that it is at present not to be procured. Lastly, it may be observed, that since Ridley's *Codex Heracleensis* contains the text of the Philoxenian version, in the Acts and in the Epistles, as well as in the Gospels, it is the only known manuscript which contains the whole of this version, not excepting the celebrated *Codex Angelicus.* See Adler's *Vers. Syr.* p. 74.

24. Our author here alludes to Storr's *Dissertatio de versionibus Syriacis*, published in 1772, in which is a particular chapter *De versionis indole*, p. 81—100. but it is extraordinary that he makes no mention of the very best critical description that has been hitherto given of the Philoxenian version, likewise written by Professor Storr, and published in 1780, in the seventh volume of the *Repertorium.*

PAGE 68.

25. See the Notes to sect. 6. particularly Note 12.

26. Our author has here given the same examples as in his Introduction, with the addition of two others, λεπτα, Mark xii. 42. and κεραμιον, Mark xiv. 13. which the author of the Philoxenian version has retained, and written in Syriac characters.

PAGE 69.

27. Here again are given the same examples, to which are added some other instances of this ridiculous mode of translating, for instance συλλυπημενος, Mark iii. 5. by ܠܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ 'simul et contristatus,' in order to express the Greek συν, and εκφοβοι, Mark ix. 6. by ܠܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ 'e timore,' in order to express the Greek εκ.

28. An example of this kind, which our author gives in his Orient. Bibl. is Φαρισε, which in one instance is written ܦܪܝܫܐ, according to the Oriental orthography, in another ܦܪܝܫܐ, in imitation of the Greek.

PAGE 70.

29. Literally 'in loco loco,' that is 'in singulis locis.'

30. Namely, with the Codex Alexandrinus, Mark v. 7. 11. with the Codex Collegii Novi, ch. v. 15. with the Montfortianus, ch. i. 31. the Parisinus sextus, ch. viii. 17. and Stephani octavus, ch. vi. 24. xiv. 43.

PAGE 71.

31. Our author should rather have said in all the manuscripts of the Philoxenian version at present known, except the Codex Barsalibæi, and the Codex Parisinus, in which last MS. it is not in the text, but only in the margin. (Storr de vers. Syr. p. 55.) Whether the Codex Barsalibæi has it in the text, or in the margin, Dr. Ridley has not related. Asseman, in his catalogue of the Medicean library published at Florence in 1752, had asserted that the passage was contained in the Codex Florentinus, but Adler, who has carefully examined this MS.

MS. says in his *Verf. Syr.* p. 55. *Deest certe et in nostro, et omnibus quos vidi utriusque versionis Syriacæ exemplis.*

32. Storr says only *paullo* aliter, quam versionis exemplar Usserianum, e quo locus venit in editiones plures. And this trifling difference is such as to leave no room for doubt that the translation of this passage, as it stood in A Usher's MS. whether in the margin or in the text, was the very same version, as is found in the margin of the Paris manuscript. This appears from Note 41 to the second section of this chapter.

33. That is, the Codex Heracleensis.

PAGE 72.

34. The Codex Barfalibæi.

35. Because the word would then be in statu emphatico, and could have no reference to ⲓⲛ in which case the passage of the Philoxenian version would literally express $\mu\upsilon\sigma\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma,\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\phi\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\rho\omega\delta\eta\ \epsilon\pi\text{---}\sigma\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota.$

PAGE 73.

36. See Note 13. to Chap. vi. sect. 8. Also Adler's *Verf. Syr.* p. 64, 65.

37. In addition to those selected by Wettstein, a very complete collection of the various readings of the Philoxenian version of the four Gospels, in reference to the Greek text, has been communicated by Professor Storr in the tenth volume of the *Repertorium*, p. 1—58. And in the seventh volume of the *Repertorium*, p. 3—5. 27—38. 51. 75. he has corrected the mistakes, which had been made by Wettstein. Of the marginal readings Professor Adler has given a very accurate collation in his *Verf. Syr.* p. 79—134; of which he says quantum pretium hisce variis lectionibus e codicibus collectis, qui septimo sæculo præstantiores jam haberentur, tribuendum sit quisque facile judicabit.

S E C T. XII.

PAGE 74.

1. The only translation hitherto discovered of Mar Abba, or Paul the monk, is the story of the adulteress in the Cod. Barfalibæi and Codex Parisinus. An Arabic writer, quoted by Asséman in his *Orient. Bibl. Tom. II. p. 412.* relates that Mar Abba translated into Syriac both the Old and New Testament, but no copies of this version are at present known. With respect to Paul the monk, it is difficult to determine who he was, or whether he translated more, than the above-mentioned passage in the Paris manuscript. Asséman, though he has a long list of Bishops of the name of Paul, mentions only three monks of that name (*Tom. III. P. I. p. 286. 489. 498.*), but no translation is ascribed to any one of them, nor even to any Bishop of that name, except to Paul of Tela. If we suppose these two persons to be one and the same, the story of the adulteress must be the only part of the New Testament which he translated, for Bar Hebræus ascribes to Paul of Tela a translation only of the Old. See Assémani *Bibl. Orient. Tom. II. p. 48.* After all, the tradition recorded in the Paris MS., which ascribes the translation of John viii. 1—11. to Paul, is probably false, if it be true that Mar Abba translated the passage in the Codex Barfalibæi, for both MSS. have the text of one and the same translation. See Note 41 to sect. 2.

2. The *Horreum mysteriorum* of Bar Hebræus has never been published, and the only few extracts which we have of this celebrated, and, as is said, valuable work, are those which have been given by Asséman in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis.*

3. It is well known that the reading of the printed Syriac text Acts xx. 28. is *ecclesiam Christi*, but in the Codex Syriacus Vaticanus 21, Adler found the reading *ecclesiam Dei*. See his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 17.

PAGE 75.

4. Asséman, in his *Bibl. Orient.* Tom. II. p. 283, says, ‘Præterea duæ aliæ Syriacæ, præter simplicem cui pressè inhæret, versiones identidem (scil. in Horreo mysteriorum) citantur, nimirum Heracleensis et Karkaphensis, hoc est Montana, qua videlicet incolæ montium utuntur.’ Now as the words *Heracleensis* and *Karkaphensis* are immediately preceded by ‘præter simplicem,’ it seems from this description that the *Karkaphensis* was a version as distinct from the *simplex*, as the *Heracleensis*. But several critics have supposed it to be only a particular edition of the *Peshito*, or even nothing more than the name of some celebrated MS. of that version, because our author asserts that the *Karkaphensis* was used by the Nestorians, who are known to have adhered to the *Peshito*. But this assertion is grounded on no authority, for Asséman, Tom. III. P. II. p. 379. where he speaks of the Eastern Nestorians, makes no mention of the *Karkaphensis*, and, Tom. II. p. 283. where he speaks of the *Karkaphensis*, he says only that it was used by the inhabitants of the mountains, without determining to what party they belonged. It is true that in the sentence immediately following that, which is quoted at the beginning of this note, he speaks of the *variæ lectiones Nestorianorum*, but this sentence he introduces by the word *Demum*, which excludes all connection between them and the *Karkaphensis*. The preceding supposition is confirmed by an observation, for which I am indebted to Professor Paulus, that in Assémani *Bibl. Orient.* T. II. p. 500. is described a Chaldee MS. with the following title, *Onomasticon, seu Lectiones Vet. et Nov. Testamenti juxta traditionem Karkaphitarum, hoc est Syrorum in montanis habitantium*. Professor Adler, on the contrary, contends that the *Karkaphensis*, or as some write it *Carcufensis*, is not a distinct version from the *versio simplex*. The question can never be decided with any certainty, till the extracts are collated, which Bar Hebræus has given of this version in his *Horreum Mysteriorum*: a
work

work which was never printed, but it is preserved in manuscript in the Medicean library, and described in the catalogue of Evodius Assëman. There is also a MS. in the Bodleian library containing the Syriac works of Bar Hebræus, noted Codex 6. among Huntingdon's manuscripts, and described T. I. p. 279, N°. 5752 of the *Catalogi MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti*. It is also described in Uri's Catalogue N°. XXV. among the Syriac manuscripts.

5. Professor Adler's biblical and critical journey to Rome, or, according to the German title, *Biblisch critische Reise nach Rom*, was published at Altona in 1783. But he has given the most complete description of this MS. in his *Versiones Syriacæ* p. 137—202, published at Copenhagen in 1789. The eighth copper-plate annexed to this important work contains a fac simile of the characters of the MS. being a copy of Mat. xxvii. 12—22. As the description is given in Latin, and therefore intelligible to every reader, an abstract may appear unnecessary, but as the MS. is of great importance, contains a version hitherto unknown, and this treatise, which is the only one where an account of it is to be found, may be difficult to be procured in England, I will extract the few following particulars in addition to what is mentioned by our author, who published the fourth edition of his *Introduction* before Adler's *Versiones Syriacæ* appeared, and who therefore could communicate no more, than what he had received in letters from Adler, during his residence in Rome.

The manuscript is written on thick vellum, consists of 196 leaves of the quarto size, and each page is divided into two columns. It appears from the subscription that the transcript was taken in a monastery at Antioch in the year 1030. Its characters approach more nearly to the Hebrew than the ancient Syriac, in Dolath the point is omitted which distinguishes it from Rish, and the letters F and P, both of which are expressed in the common Syriac Alphabet by ω , are here denoted by two separate characters. In confirmation of the opinion that the dia-

lect, in which it is written, was that spoken in Jerusalem, Adler produces a variety of Greek words adopted in this version, many of which are used indeed in the Philoxenian, but most of which are found in the writings of the Talmudists, and in the Talmud of Jerusalem. He likewise gives an alphabetical list of Oriental words, that are peculiar to the Jerusalem dialect. In addition to the remark which our author has made that the status emphaticus is expressed not by | as in common Syriac, but by |., and that the 3^d. pers. of the future is denoted not by Nun but by Jod, characteristic marks which distinguish the East from the West Aramaean dialect, may be added that the pronoun of the third person affixed to plural nouns is not ܢܐܢܐ as in the common Syriac or West Aramaean, but generally ܢܐ. Various exceptions however must be made, which Adler ascribes to the negligence of the transcriber, p. 147. *mox Syriacæ orthographiæ vel grammaticæ adhæret, mox in alia omnia abit; cui amanuensis inconstantia vel negligentia illud etiam tribuo, quod prima persona futuri interdum Jud, vel Nun præformativum habeat, quod ab omnibus orientalium linguis prorsus alienum est.* After having given a specimen of this MS. taken from Matth. xxvii. 3—32. he observes, *satis constat ex his speciminibus dialectum esse incultam et inconcinnam Chaldaicæ, similiorem quam Syriacæ; orthographiam autem vagam, inconstantem arbitrariam, et ab imperito librario rescribendo et corrigendo denuo impeditam.* He then gives a long and accurate collation of the readings of this version with those of the most ancient and best Greek MSS. the result of which inquiry with respect to the Cambridge and Vatican MSS. is the following, Itaque inter CLXV. varietates, undecies sequitur versio Hierosolymitana solum codicem D, eundemque, uno alterove alio accedente quatuordecies, vel plurimis affinibus Cantabrigiensi suffragantibus quinquagies quater. Summa LXXIX. Vaticano autem calculum addit soli ter, et, aliis variorum ordinum libris concinentibus, bis et octogies. Summa LXXXV. The story of the adulteress, which is omitted

in the Peshito and Philoxenian, is found in this version, which passage is printed by Adler, p. 190. and on which he observes, *concinit fere cum codice Cantabrigiensi*: and Matth. xxvii. 17. it expresses, *quem vultis e duobus dimittam vobis, Jesum Bar Rabban, an Jesum qui dicitur Christus*, (see Note 23 to the 11th section of the preceding chapter.) Lastly, with respect to the antiquity of this version, the learned writer closes his account in the following manner. *Ostendimus eam antiquissimis auctoritatibus suffragari, per antiquos codices Vaticanum et Cantabrigiensem plerumque sequi, Patribus quoque Origeni, Chrysostomo, aliis, non raro adstipulari: quæ faciunt ut magnam quoque versioni antiquitatem auctoritatemque tribuere velimus. Obstare quidem videtur dialectus, inculta non solum et barbara, sed multis quoque vocabulis exoticis referta, græcis atque adeo latinis, quæ vix usu recepta fuerint apud Judæos ante sæculum post Christum natum sextum. Sed tamen, cum eandem dialectum reperiamus in Talmude Hierosolymitano, qui ex plurimorum, ni fallimur, eruditorum consensu circa sæculum quartum absolutus fuit (libris enim Cabbalisticis Bahir et Zohar immerito tam remota antiquitas a Judæis tribuitur), non impedit quo minus interpretationem nostram eodem circiter tempore, vel saltem intra quartum et sextum sæculum Hierosolymis editam fuisse statuere audeamus. In point of antiquity therefore it holds a middle rank between the Peshito and the Philoxenian. The readings of this important version, which had been extracted by Adler, are quoted by Professor Birch in his edition of the Greek Testament under the title *Versio Syra Hierosolymitana*.*

PAGE 76.

6. Professor Adler has adopted the title *Versio Hierosolymitana*, but Father Georgi has proposed another title, that of *Versio Syriaco-Assyriaca*, to which Adler objects. See *Epistolæ, una R. P. Antonii Georgii Eremitæ Augustin, Procuratoris generalis; altera Jacobi Georgii Chr. Adleri in quibus loca nonnulla operis Ad-*

leriani de versionibus Syriacis examinantur. Hafniæ 1791.

S E C T. XIII.

PAGE 76.

1. The best accounts of the Coptic version are given in Simon Histoire Critique des versions du Nouveau Testament, ch. 16. in the Preface to Wilkins's edition of the Coptic N. T. published at Oxford in 1716, in Le Long Bibliotheca sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. sect. 10. and particularly by the learned Woide in a German essay printed in 1778, in the third volume of the Kielische Beyträge p. 1—100. The whole of this essay, which contains not only historical but critical accounts of the Egyptian versions both Coptic and Sahidic, highly deserves to be translated into English, a task which I shall perhaps undertake when the present work is completed, and will in the mean time, as a supplement to our author's description, select some few remarks relative to the New Testament.

2. Niebuhr, in his description of Arabia, p. 86. relates that though the Gospels are still read in the Coptic version in the public service, it is not understood even by the priests, and that immediately after the lessons have been read in Coptic, the same are read in Arabic, which is the present language both of the upper and the lower Egypt.

3. Woide published likewise at Oxford, in 1778, a Coptic and Sahidic Grammar under the following title, Christ. Scholz Grammatica Ægypti utriusque dialecti, quam breviavit, illustravit, edidit C. G. Woide. An excellent Coptic Grammar was also published at Parma in 1783 under the title, Didymi Taurinensis literaturæ Copticæ rudimentum.

PAGE 77.

4. Woide, p. 97. of the essay above-quoted, contends that the Egyptian version used by Antonius in the third century

century was written not in the Sahidic but the Coptic, because it is related by Palladius, that Antonius lived in a monastery of Alexandria, where the former was not understood. He concludes therefore, as Antonius actually read an Egyptian version of the Bible, and was so ignorant as to understand only the dialect of his own country, (for Athanasius says of him *μη μεμαθηκε γραμματα*) that the Coptic version existed before the middle of the third century. See Wilkins's Prolegomena, p. 5. and Renaudot *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, Tom. I. p. 205. 209. But admitting that Antonius read the bible in the Coptic, we must not immediately conclude that it was the very same Coptic version, which is contained in the MSS. from which Wilkins published his edition: for this is a question which we have not at present sufficient data to determine. Woide's arguments for the antiquity of an Egyptian version of the N. T. are given p. 76—100, but none of them, except that which has been just quoted, apply to the dialect of the lower Egypt in particular. His most satisfactory proof is the following. The rules of Pachomius for the conduct of the Egyptian monks, a work which was afterwards translated into Greek, and also into Latin by Jerom, was written in Egyptian. Now one of these rules is the following: 'All persons admitted to the order of monk, if unable to read, shall learn the letters of the A. B. C. that they may be able to read and write: after which they shall learn every day by heart some passages of scripture.' Men therefore of such profound ignorance would not have been able to read the bible, unless they had a translation in their native language. Ludovicus Pickius, or according to his French name, Louis Picques, who was acquainted with the Coptic language, refers this version to the fifth century. See Mill's Prolegomena, sect. 1509. The arguments for the antiquity of the Sahidic version in particular, which Woide refers to the second century, will be given in the following section. Dr. Münter likewise has published a Dissertation on the antiquity of the Coptic version. It

was printed at Copenhagen in 1790, under the title, *F. Munteri Dissertatio de ætat. versionam N. T. Copticarum*, 4^{to}.

5. Abest in versione Coptica quæ est in Cod. 336, non ab eâ quæ est in Cod. 329: item in Arabica versionis Copticæ translatione.

Millius ad Johan. vii. 53.

PAGE 78.

6. Marshall had even prepared the four Gospels for the press, but died before they could be printed. See *Le Long Bibl. sacra. ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 187.*

7. The following is the title of this work, *Novum Testamentum Ægyptium vulgo Copticum ex MSS. Bodleianis descriptis, cum Vaticanis et Parisiensibus contulit, et in Latinum sermonem convertit David Wilkins, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Presbyter. Oxonii 1716, 4to. maj.* The MSS. used by Wilkins in the publication of this edition he has described in the second chapter of the *Prolegomena*. They are also described in Uri's Catalogue, p. 319, 320. For an account of other manuscripts of the Coptic version see *Le Long Bibl. sacra. Tom. I. p. 140—144. ed. Paris. or P. I. p. 284—296. ed. Boerner.* Uri's Catalogue, p. 318—322, the Catalogues *MSS. Bibl. Regiæ, Vol. I. p. 71. and Note 11 to sect. 3. of this chapter.* With regard to the antiquity of the Coptic manuscripts, Montfaucon in his *Palæographia Græca, Lib. IV. cap. 7. p. 313, says, Libri Coptici, qui supersunt, non admodum vetusti sunt, nullumque hæcenus vidi, qui annos plus quam quingentos præferret.* But Wilkins in his *Prolegomena, p. 6. says that the Codex Huntingtonianus 17. is dated 'the year of the martyrs 790,' that is the year of Christ 1074.*

PAGE 79.

8. Woide collated with the printed text of Wilkins a Berlin MS. of the Coptic version, as far as relates to the Gospel of St. Mark, a copy of which had been communicated to him by Scholz; but it does not appear that
this

this collation has ever been published. Professor Alter in his edition of the Greek Testament, published at Vienna in 1787, in two vols. 8vo. has given, Vol. I. p. 751—806. *Variae lectiones in quatuor Evangelia collectæ ex editione versionis Copticæ a Wilkins editæ*, which he has selected with great diligence and accuracy: and Vol. II. p. 921—940. *Variae lectiones in Apocalypsin ex versione Coptica.*

9. Millii Proleg. §. 1462. See also § 1508.

10. Beside these readings, which Wilkins in his Prolegomena, p. 11—40. had erroneously quoted from the Coptic version, Woide p. 44—50. of the above-mentioned essay has given likewise the following.

Matth. xx. 34. Wilkins quotes the Coptic for ‘per-spexerunt,’ on which Woide observes that the Coptic verb admits likewise the sense of the Greek *αναβλεπω*. But Wilkins has rightly observed that the reading *αυτων οι οφθαλμοι* is omitted in the Coptic.

Mark iii. 21. ‘Deliquium animi patitur. Græcus *εξεση*.’ Woide observes that the Coptic noun properly expresses *εκσασις*.

Mark vi. 27. Pro *ενεχθηναι* Coptica versio habet ‘ut amputaret.’ Woide answers that the Coptic translator appears to have read ‘*απενεχθηναι*, auferri caput ejus.’

Mark vi. 51. ‘mirabantur.’ Rather ‘perterrebantur.’

Luke v. 5. ‘Expandemus retia.’ Woide observes that the Coptic reading is ‘dimittemus retia.’

Acts xi. 4. ‘Ante illos.’ Read ‘apud illos.’

Acts xiii. 22. ‘Occiso illo. Græcus *μεσσησας αυτον*.’ Woide observes that the reading of the Coptic is the same as in the Greek,

Rom. iii. 27. ‘Pro *εξεκλεισθη* noster legit muta facta est.’ Woide replies, that the Coptic admits indeed that sense, but that it also expresses *συνεκλεισεν αυτην*, which amounts to the same as *συνεκλεισθη*.

1 Cor. ix. 26. Wilkins translates the Coptic word for *ποικτευω* by ‘do,’ saying that it signifies ‘pugno,’ only when it is followed by a preposition expressive of ‘contra.’ But Woide observes that the Coptic verb is used in the sense

sense of pugno, Zechariah xiv. 14. without any such preposition.

1 Cor. xiii. 3. 'ut comburam, uti et Græcus *ἵνα καυθῶμαι*. Woide says that the Coptic version expresses *ἵνα καυχῶμαι*.

2 Cor. i. 12. 'sanctitate et iustitia' Græcus legit *ἀπλοτητι καὶ εὐδικρινείᾳ*. Woide observes that the Coptic expresses *ἀγιοτητι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*.

Phil. iii. 2. 'immolatum circumcisionis,' pro *τὴν κατατομὴν*. Woide replies, that the Coptic corresponds to the Greek.

1 Tim. vi. 11. 'in humilitate.' Græcus, Arabs, et Æthiops, non addunt. Woide says that the only difference between the Coptic and the Greek readings is, that the latter is *πρᾶοτητα*, the former *ἐν πρᾶοτητι*. But he acknowledges that there is more in the Coptic than in the Greek text, namely, that two different words are used expressive of *πρᾶοτης*, one of which he supposed to have been originally a scholion.

Heb. xi. 12. 'arefacto corpore,' pro *νεκρωμένῳ*. Woide conjectures that here is an erratum in the Coptic text, and that the true reading is a word expressive of *καθαίρμενῳ*.

2 Pet. i. 9. for *τυφλὸς ἐστὶ, μυωπαζὼν*, Wilkins quotes the Coptic as having a different reading, which Woide denies.

Rev. i. 6. 'regnum spirituale,' pro *βασιλεις, καὶ ἱερεις*. But Woide asserts that the Coptic expresses *βασιλεια, ἱερατεύμα*.

Rev. x. 2. Wilkins quotes the Coptic for 'virtus,' where *βιβλαριδιον* is in the Greek. Here Woide conjectures that there is an error of a single letter in the Coptic word; which alteration being made, it would signify 'liber.'

Rev. xvii. 10. Wilkins quotes the Coptic for 'reliquus non est,' where the Greek is *οὐ εἰς ἐσιν*. But Woide says that the Coptic word admits not the sense of reliquus, and that it signifies *ἄτος, ἐκεῖνος, and ἑτέρος*.

Rev.

Rev. xix. 10. where the Greek is *της προφητειας*, Wilkins quotes the Coptic for 'justitia.' On which Woide observes that the Coptic expresses rather *πνευμα αληθειας*, than *πνευμα δικαιοσυνης*.

Woide has likewise produced a list of readings which Wilkins had quoted as differing from the Greek text, where both the Greek and the Coptic in fact agree. They are taken from the following verses: Matth. iii. 16. xi. 25. xii. 5, 6. xxiv. 7. Mark iv. 1. Luke ii. 52. vii. 9. John xx. 1. Rom. vii. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 19.

PAGE 80.

11. Beside the foregoing examples alleged by our author, Woide, p. 51. has given the following, in which Wilkins has erroneously translated: Matth. v. 47. 'quid mali facitis.' Read, 'quid magis facitis.' vi. 2. 'miser ricordias.' Read, 'miser ricordiam,' or rather 'eleemosy nam.' viii. 13. 'mundatus est.' Read, 'sanatus est.' xvii. 15. 'præcessit.' Read, 'prævenit.' Mark i. 27. 'quæ est ista doctrina nova?' Read, 'quid est hoc? doctrina nova est.' Luke i. 70. 'usque in sæculum.' Read, 'a sæculo.' i. 76. 'præcedes ambulare.' Read, 'præcedes' alone. xxi. 16. 'occidemini ab illis.' Read, 'occident e vobis.'

12. As the account here given is written in Latin, a translation is unnecessary. It has the following title, *Variae lectiones Epistolarum Johannis et Judæ, e versione Ægyptiaca utriusque dialecti collectæ.* The manuscript used by Woide is in the Bodleian library, and marked, as Woide says, *Codex Huntingtonianus 394.*

S E C T. XIV.

PAGE 80.

1. The most complete account of the Sahidic version of the New Testament is given in the above-mentioned essay of Woide, and in the following learned and valuable work, *Friderici Münteri Commentatio de indole versionis*

versionis Novi Testamenti Sahidicæ. Accedunt fragmenta epistolarum Pauli ad Timotheum ex membranis Sahidicis Musei Borgiani Velitris, Hafniæ, 1789, 4to.

PAGE 81.

2. Since the publication of our author's Introduction, a part of St. John's Gospel has been printed at Rome in 1789, under the following title, *Fragmentum Evangelii St. Johannis Græco-copto-thebaicum sæculi iv. Opera et studio F. Augustini Antonii Georgii Eremitæ Augustiniani*. It was taken from a Greek-Coptic manuscript in the possession of Cardinal Borgia, the Greek text of which Professor Birch has collated, and quoted in his Greek Testament, under the title *Codex Borgianus* 1. To this may be added the fragments of the epistles to Timothy, mentioned in the preceding Note. The learned Woide published proposals in 1778, for an edition of several fragments of the Sahidic version, comprehending about a third part of the New Testament, under the following title, *Fragmenta N. T. juxta interpretationem dialecti superioris Ægypti, quæ Thebaidica, seu Sahidica appellatur e MSS. Oxoniensibus descripta quæ latine reddet, et simul etiam de antiquitate et variis lectionibus hujus interpretationis differet C. G. Woide*. The learned editor survived not the publication of his work, but he had prepared the greatest part of it for the press, and a part of it was already printed before his death. It has been completed by Dr. Ford, who published at Oxford in 1799, under the following title, *Fragmenta Novi Testamenti e versione Ægyptiacâ dialecti Thebaidicæ, Sahidicæ, seu superioris Ægypti*. Some fragments of the Sahidic version of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John have been likewise published by Mingarelli in the following work, *Ægyptiorum codicum reliquiæ, Venetiis in bibliotheca Naniana asservatæ. Bononiæ, 1785, 4to*. Manuscripts, or rather fragments of manuscripts of the Sahidic version of the N. T. are preserved in the libraries of Rome, Paris, Oxford, Berlin, and Venice. Those, which have been used by Woide, he

he describes p. 55. of his Essay on the Egyptian Versions. They are the following, Codex Askewanus, Cod. Brucianus, Cod. Parisinus 44, and the Codices Huntingtoniani 3, 4, 5, 393, 394, in the Bodleian library. A list of manuscripts, containing fragments of the Sahidic version, is also given in Münsteri Specimen versionum Danielis Copticarum Romæ 1786, 8vo.

3. Our author, in the third volume of his Orient. Bibl. has printed a collation, which had been communicated by Woide, of the Sahidic version, and the Codex Cantabrigiensis in the Acts of the Apostles. The Sahidic manuscript used by Woide was the Codex Huntingtonianus 394. The collation is as follows:

Ch. i. 2. The Sahidic version has the addition κηρυσσειν το ευαγγελιον, but with this difference, that it is placed before ους εξελεξατο, where the Cod. Cant. has ως εξελεξατο και εκελευσε κηρυσσειν το ευαγγελιον.

V. 3. After συναλιζομενος, both have μετ' αυτων.

V. 5. At the end of the verse, both have εως της πεντεκοστης.

Ch. ii. 41. Both omit ασμενως.

Ch. v. 4. Cod. Cant. ποιησαι το πονηρον. The same is expressed in the Sahidic.

V. 5. Both omit ταυτα.

V. 31. At the end of the verse, both add εν αυτω.

V. 35. Cod. Cant. ειπε τε προς της αρχοντας και συνεδρις. The same is expressed in the Sahidic.

Ch. vi. 2. After ειπον, both add προς αυτες, and v. 5. ουτος after ο λογος.

V. 8. At the end, both add δια τε ονοματος τε Κυρις Ιησους Χριστος.

V. 14. Both omit βλασφημα.

V. 48. ναοις is omitted in both.

V. 58. After ελιθοβολεν, both add αυτον, which is likewise found in the Syriac and the Coptic.

Ch. viii. 1. After διωγμος μεγας, both add και θλιψις, and at the end of the verse οι εμειναν εν Ιερουσαλημ.

V. 22. Both have κυρις, also the Coptic.

V. 28. αναγιγνωσκων.

Ch. x.

Ch. x. 23. After *εισκαλεσαμενος αυτες*, they add *ο Πετρος*, as also the Syriac.

Ch. xi. 29. Both omit *Καισαρος*.

Ch. xiii. 33. Both have *τον Κυριον Ιησυν Χριστον*.

Ch. xv. 1. *και τω εθει Μωσεως περιπαλει*.

V. 20. At the end of the verse, both add *και οσα μη θελεε αυτοις γενεσθαι, ελεοις μη ποιειε*.

V. 23. After *γραφαιες*, both add *επισολην*, like the Syriac and the Vulgate.

Ch. xvi. 9. After *εως*, both add *κατα προσωπον αυτη*.

V. 10. For *ως δε το οραμα ειδεν*, both have *διεγερεθεις δε διηγησατο το οραμα ημιν*, a remarkable coincidence as being peculiar to them alone.

Ch. xvii. 5. *εξαγαγειν*.

V. 21. After *επιδημυντες*, both add *εις αυτες*.

Ch. xviii. 12. After *τω Παυλω*, both add *επιθεντες τας χειρας αυτη*. But the Cod. Cant. has a still further addition.

V. 19. After *αυτος εισελθων*, the Sahidic version expresses *τω επιοντι σαββατω*, which is found also in the Cod. Cant. though with a different construction, as may be seen in Mill, or Wettstein.

Ch. xix. 2. Both have *ει πνευμα αγιον λαμβανουσιν τινες*, a remarkable reading peculiar to them alone.

V. 5. After *Ιησ*, both add *Χριστ*.

V. 25. After *ανδρες*, both add *συντεχνιται*.

V. 37. After *ταυτη*, both add *ενθαδε*.

Ch. xx. 4. For *Ασιανοι*, both express *Εφεσιοι*.

V. 24. After *διαμαρτυρασθαι*, both add *Ιουδαιοις και Ελλησι*.

V. 34. Both have *αι χειρες ης*.

Ch. xxi. 1. After *Παταρα*, both add *και μυρα*.

V. 25. After *εθων*, both add *υδεν εχουσιν λεγειν προς σε*.

V. 40. After *επιτρεψαντος αυτη*, both add *τε χιλιαρχε*.

This remarkable agreement between the Sahidic version and the Cod. Cant. which was first discovered by Woide, may lead to very important conclusions. With respect to our author's reference to the tenth vol. of his Orient. Bibl. see Note 12, to the foregoing section.

Those

Those who would examine this subject more minutely, may have recourse to Münster de indole versionis Sahidicæ, p. 10—75. This learned writer observes likewise the coincidence of the Sahidic version with the Codex Stephani *η*. Lastly, Woide has given a very accurate collation of the Sahidic version in the Gospel of St. Matthew, with the common printed Greek text in the above-mentioned essay, p. 57—75.

4. These have been already given in the preceding Note.

5. It is extraordinary that our author should assert that the Sahidic version omits *εως*, Acts xvi. 9. as Woide, in the very catalogue which he himself has printed, and which is translated in the preceding Note, quotes the Sahidic version in that passage for *εως κατα προσωπον αυτης*, which reading Mill has quoted at full length from the Cantabrigienfis. The addition therefore of *κατα προσωπον αυτης* is in this instance the distinguishing mark of the Sahidic version, and the Cambridge manuscript, and shews the analogy between the readings of the Egyptian, or Alexandrian, and the Western edition of the Greek Testament. But the Edessene edition appears to have no connection with the present example, as the Syriac version has not the addition above-mentioned.

6. The Sahidic version, according to Woide, was made in the second century. His principal argument is drawn out at full length, p. 80—94. of the essay quoted Note 1, to the preceding section. It is grounded on two Sahidic manuscripts, one formerly in the possession of Dr. Askeu, the other brought from Egypt by the celebrated Bruce: both of which are, I believe, at present in the British Museum. The former contains a work entitled *Sophia*, and written by Valentinus in the beginning of the second century. That Valentinus wrote a book with this title, appears from the testimony of Tertullian, in the second chapter of his treatise *adv. Valentinum*; and that this manuscript contains that very work, Woide endeavours to shew by several arguments; the principal of which is, that psalms are found in it, which belong not to the sacred collec-

collection, agreeably to the account of Tertullian, who says (c. 2. adv. Valent.) docet ipsa Sophia, non quidem Valentini, sed Salomonis; and again, (cap. 20. de carne Christi) nobis Psalmi patrocinantur non quidem Apostatae, et Hæretici, et Platonici Valentini, sed sanctissimi David. He relates also that Origen, in his Catena in Jobum, speaks of the Psalms of Valentinus. Now this manuscript contains various passages both from the Old and New Testament, which coincide with the fragments of the Sahidic version now extant; whence he concludes that a Sahidic version of the whole Bible not only existed so early as the beginning of the second century, but that it was the same as that, of which we have various fragments, and which, if put together, would form perhaps a complete Sahidic version of the Bible. The other manuscript to which he appeals contains two books, the one entitled Βιβλος της γνωσεως, the other Βιβλος λογος κατα μυσηριον. Now that this was written by a Gnostic, as well as the other manuscript, appears both from the title and the contents, and Woide concludes therefore that the author lived in the second century. And as various passages are quoted in it both from the Old and New Testament, Woide deduces the same inference as from the foregoing. It appears then, if no objections can be made to these arguments, that proofs may be alleged of a higher antiquity in favour of the Sahidic version, than can be produced in favour of any other version of the New Testament; and it must of course be of the highest importance in the criticism of the Greek Testament. At the same time it must be acknowledged, that the oldest historical evidence for the high antiquity of an Egyptian version is that of Epiphanius and Theodoret, the former quoted by Semler, in his Apparatus ad N. T. interpretationem, p. 64. the latter by Wilkins in the Prolegomena to his Coptic N. T. p. 6.

That the Coptic and Sahidic are independent versions, both made from the original Greek, and that therefore both may be quoted as separate evidence for a reading in the Greek Testament, appears from the difference of their readings, and the circumstance that additions in
the

the one are omitted in the other. See Münter de indole versionis Sahidicæ, p. 8.

Beside the versions in the Coptic and Sahidic dialects, Georgi, the learned editor of the *Fragmentum Evangelii Johannis græco-copto-thebaicum*, has discovered in a manuscript belonging to Cardinal Borgia, a fragment of a version written in a still different Egyptian dialect, which he calls 'dialectus Ammoniacæ.' It contains only the two following passages of the first epistle to the Corinthians vii, 36—ix, 16. and xiv, 33—xv, 33. Dr. Münter, in his treatise de indole vers. Sahid. p. 78—80. has printed the Sahidic and Ammoniac texts of 1 Cor. ix. 10—16. in parallel columns, in order to present the reader with a distinct view of the similarity or difference between the two versions. But he is unwilling to assign to the latter the name of a separate dialect, because the chief difference consists in the orthography of single words. Now the propriety of the application depends entirely on the latitude, in which we take the term in question.

S E C T. XV.

PAGE 82.

1. See also Waltoni Prolegom. xiv. and Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. sect. 5.

2. The Arabic versions may be divided into four classes. 1. Those taken immediately from the Syriac. 2. From the Coptic. 3. From the Greek. 4. From the Latin. That various Arabic versions have been made from the Latin in modern times, by Oriental monks during their residence in Rome, who having learnt from the Romish clergy that the Vulgate was the standard after which all versions should be regulated, proposed to render the most essential service to their brethren in the East, by translating it into their native language, is evident from what is related by Professor Adler, in his Biblical and critical journey to Rome, p.

178.; and an Arabic version of this kind was actually published at Rome in 1752, by Raphael Tuki, bishop of Arsan. With respect to those which are written in parallel columns with the Syriac and the Coptic, of which copies exist in the royal library in Paris, it is reasonable to suppose that they were not made from the Greek, but immediately from those ancient versions, to which they were added as a mean of understanding them, after the languages, in which these were written, had ceased to be spoken. For the same reason, those annexed to the Greek text were probably taken immediately from the Greek. But of these Greek-Arabic manuscripts, only two have hitherto been discovered, namely, that in the University library at Leyden, mentioned in the following note, and another in the library of St. Mark at Venice, described in Birch's *Prolegomena*, p. 56.

3. Simon not only appeals to this catalogue in support of the assertion that a Greek *Lectionarium*, accompanied with an Arabic translation, is preserved in the University library of Leyden, but confirms the account by a letter from Le Moine, Professor of Divinity in that University. The manuscript is described by Wetstein, in his *Prolegomena*, p. 63. under the title *Codex Scaligeri*, and is quoted in his various readings as the *Codex Evangelistariorum* 6. See also p. 410. N°. 38. of the Leyden Catalogue, published in 1716, folio.

4. It is possible that the Christian religion was preached in Arabia, as well as in other countries of the East, but it never was the established religion of the country, as in Syria and Egypt, for even the temple of Mecca was a Heathen temple till the time of Mohammed. A translation of the Bible therefore into Arabic was wholly unnecessary before the conquests of the Saracens, when the Arabic became the vernacular language of Christian countries.

5. An Arabic version therefore might have existed before the time of Mohammed; but that it actually did exist, this argument affords not even a presumption.

PAGE 83.

6. Our author must here have mistaken Walton's meaning, for Walton expressly declares that his arguments against the antiquity of the Arabic version, relate to that version only, which is printed in the Paris and London Polyglots. See his fourteenth Prolegomenon, sect. 17.

7. It is not true that the proper names in the Bible must necessarily be expressed by all Arabic writers according to one and the same orthography. The word Joshua, for instance, is written by Saadias, in his Arabic version of the Bible, *يوشوع*, but in the Koran *يوشع*, which last orthography is followed by the author of the Arabic version of the Old Testament printed in the Paris Polyglot. This is one of the examples produced by Walton, to shew that this version was made after the time of Mohammed.

8. There is no necessity for having recourse to this argument, in order to answer the objection derived from the Arabic translation of *ῥῶς*, Luke xi. 31. for it is absolutely false that *ῥῶς* is there translated by *قبلة*, since not only in the Erpenian and Polyglot editions, but likewise in the Roman edition of the Gospels, *ῥῶς* is translated by *تيمان*, which signifies, 1. Regio Teman. 2. Auf-ter. Whether this word, which is used also in the Syriac, and there written *ܬܝܡܢ*, can be used as an argument that the printed Arabic version of the Gospels was taken immediately from the Syriac, deserves perhaps to be examined, but it belongs not to the subject of this note.

9. This answer rather corroborates than confutes the objection, for it affords a presumption that no Arabic version of our four canonical Gospels at that time existed.

PAGE 84.

10. Admitting Mohammed to have been ignorant in matters of chronology in the highest possible degree, and that he would have perverted the accounts of the four

Evangelists, even if their Gospels had been known to him, it does not appear how this ignorance can be used as an argument for the existence of an Arabic version.

II. Our author has shewn, that the arguments against the possibility of an Arabic version before the time of Mohammed are of no weight, but he concludes too hastily from the possibility to the probability of its existence before that period. It appears from Note 4, that there was no necessity for an Arabic version before the seventh century, we are therefore not warranted to ascribe to any of the Arabic versions of the New Testament a higher antiquity, than that period. It has been shewn above, that, though Christianity was not only propagated, but even established in Syria before the close of the first century, no certain historical evidence can be produced of the existence of a Syriac version before the fourth century: from a country therefore, where Christianity was not the established religion, though single converts and single societies were scattered in different parts of it, we have no reason to expect a version of the Bible in so early an age. Lastly, admitting the probability, we can arrive at no certainty, for the oldest historical accounts extend no further than the tenth century, when Rabbi Saadiah Gaon published an Arabic version of the Pentateuch. If a conjecture is allowable on a subject where history leaves us in the dark, we may suppose that most of the Arabic versions were made during the period, that elapsed between the conquests of the Saracens in the seventh century, and the crusades in the eleventh, especially about the middle of this period, when the Syriac and the Coptic, though they had ceased to be living languages, were still understood by men of education, and Arabic literature, under the patronage of Al Mamon and his successors, arrived at its highest pitch.

The age in which the Arabic *printed* version, or versions of the New Testament were written, is wholly undecided, for we have no knowledge of the manuscripts, from which the Roman edition of the four Gospels was printed,

printed, and all that we know of the manuscripts used by Gabriel Sionita, in his edition of the Paris Polyglot, and by Erpenius, in his edition of the Arabic New Testament, is that the former used a manuscript brought from Aleppo, and written in Egypt in the fourteenth century, the latter a manuscript brought from Egypt, in which the Gospels were written in the thirteenth, the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation in the fourteenth century. See Millii Prolegomena, § 1295. and the first and last pages of the preface of Erpenius, compared with Note 3. to the following section. But we are left wholly in the dark, with respect to the century, in which the versions themselves were made; for though the four Gospels in the manuscript of Erpenius are ascribed to one Nejulumam, either as the author or the new editor of a version made before his time, yet no accounts have hitherto been discovered of this author or editor, nor has Assemani, in his *Bibl. Orient.* made the least mention of any person of this name.

12. It is true that a bishop of the name of Hippolytus lived in the beginning of the third century, and wrote a treatise entitled, *Apologia pro Apocalypsi et Evangelio Johannis*: but that his See was in Arabia is mere conjecture. See *Assemani Bibl. Orient. Tom. III. P. I. p. 15.*

S E C T. XVI.

PAGE 84.

1. When Mill quotes readings from the Arabic version, he evidently means that, which is printed in the London Polyglot. See his *Prolegomena*, § 1295, 1296, 1472.

PAGE 88.

2. From this coincidence no other inference can be drawn, than that the Arabic version of the Gospels, printed in Rome in 1591, was made before the eleventh

century, for to that age the origin of the Druses is referred. See Note 21. to chap. iv. sect. 5.

PAGE 86.

3. Simon relates, in his *Hist. crit. des Versions du N. T.* ch. 18. that he had compared the Arabic version of the four Gospels printed at Rome, and afterwards reprinted in the Polyglots, with an Arabic translation of the Coptic version, and found them dissimilar, but that on comparing it with an Arabic translation of the Syriac version, he observed a great resemblance. The inference therefore deduced by the French critic was not wholly without foundation. Nor did he contend that they were one and the same version, but that they were different Arabic translations of the same Syriac, in which case a total coincidence was not to be expected. Our author on the contrary asserts, that the Arabic and Syriac versions of the Gospels are so dissimilar, that the former could not possibly have been taken from the latter. The same is asserted by his learned father, in his *Tractatio critica*, § 29. though, as well as our author, he gives no examples, for which he refers his readers to Millii *Prolegomena*, § 1296. But Mill's authority is here of little weight, for he confesses himself that he could compare only the Latin translations, and the few examples, which he has produced, relate only to proper names, one of which our author himself contends was interpolated into the Arabic in later ages. It must likewise be observed, that not one of his examples is taken from the Gospels, which alone are the subject of the present paragraph. Till a statement therefore has been made, representing the agreement and disagreement of the Roman-Arabic version of the Gospels, both with the Greek and the Syriac, in order to determine on which side the scale preponderates, we are at liberty to withhold our judgement, as no assertion can be admitted without authority.

PAGE 87.

4. Gabriel Sionita, a Maronite by birth, from the neighbour-

neighbourhood of Mount Libanus, and one of the principal editors of the Paris Polyglot, relates that he made use of a manuscript written in Egypt in the fourteenth century, but it does not appear that he was acquainted either with the name of the author, or with the age in which he lived. See Millii Prolegomena, § 1295. and Waltoni Prol. xiv. §. 23. And it is related in Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Mafch, P. I. p. 357. that it was brought to Paris immediately from Aleppo. Also in the third preface to the first volume of the Paris Polyglot, signed by Bertet and Moreau, is the following passage, ‘Gabrielem Sionitam——Syriacum et Arabicum textum ex antiquis Syrorum et Arabum manuscriptis, quos e *Palæstina* allatos penes se habet,” &c. From this manuscript, therefore, the Arabic version of the Acts and of the Epistles was taken, which was first printed in the Paris, and re-printed with additions in the London Polyglot. But our author himself acknowledges, that this version of the Acts and the Epistles can lay claim to no high antiquity, because the Greek word *ἐπιστοπος* is there adopted, and written استقف, though he endeavours to weaken the force of the arguments, which his father had brought against it.

PAGE 88.

5. The Arabic version, printed in the London Polyglot, is not a bare re-impression of the text of the Paris edition, as appears from Waltoni Proleg. xiv. § 17. and Millii Proleg. § 1295.

6. See Note 3. The example given by our author in this paragraph, like those produced by Mill, is not taken from the Gospels.

7. With respect to the Polyglot Arabic version of the Acts and the Epistles, the following is at least a presumptive argument that they were not taken from the Syriac, though it decides not the question, whether they were taken from the Greek, or the Coptic: namely, that the same Arabic word *كاهن* is used for *ιερευς*, even where the Greek word is differently rendered in the Syriac.

Compare with the Greek text the Arabic and Syriac versions Acts iv. 1. and Heb. vii. 1. But it may be doubted whether the same conclusion can be drawn with respect to the Gospels. See Note 8. to the preceding section, and Note 3. to the present section. In confirmation of our author's argument, in favour of the opinion that the Polyglot Arabic version of the epistles was made neither from the Coptic, nor the Syriac, but immediately from the Greek, may be added that *ελαχιστερος*, Eph. iii. 8. which is rendered in the Arabic by *احقر ادنيا*, is translated both in the Syriac and the Coptic by only a single word, the one expressive of 'minimus,' the other of 'servus.'

PAGE 89.

8. This date is ascribed to the manuscript by Erpenius himself, who says, in the beginning of his preface, that it was written in the year of the Martyrs 1059, or 1342 of the Christian æra, and adds, that it was written in the monastery of St. John in the desert of Thebais. But, what appears to be a contradiction, Erpenius, toward the end of the preface, gives a Latin translation of an Arabic subscription in this manuscript, dated 988 of the Martyrs, which is 1271 of the Christian æra. Now there seems to be no other method of reconciling this apparent contradiction, than to suppose, 1. That the subscription, with the date 988 of the Martyrs, is written in the manuscript at the end of the Gospels, and relates to them only, which is evidently implied in what Erpenius himself says relative to this subscription. 2. That there is another subscription at the end of the second part, which contains the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation, with the date 1059 of the Martyrs, which relates only to these books, as the former subscription to the Gospels only: and that Erpenius improperly understood the last subscription, as having reference to the whole work. If this hypothesis be agreeable to the truth, the manuscript used by Erpenius is a compound of two different manuscripts; the one written in the thirteenth, the

the other in the fourteenth century ; and it is very consistent with the opinion, that the Gospels in this manuscript were translated either from the Coptic or from the Greek, the Acts and Epistles from the Syriac. The question however can be determined with no certainty, except by those who have access to the manuscript itself, which is preserved in the University library at Leyden, marked 217, among Golius's manuscripts, and is described p. 410. N^o. 25. of the Leyden Catalogue, published in 1716, folio. For though in the edition of Erpenius there are Arabic subscriptions at the end of each book of the N. T., yet they relate not to the translator or transcriber, but to the time and place, where each book was composed by the sacred writers themselves.

9. It is likewise one of the most elegant editions, but it is very difficult to be procured.

10. Our author should have mentioned his authority for this assertion, as Mill in his Prolegomena has taken no notice of the edition of Erpenius. I have compared some of his various readings in the Acts of the Apostles, for which he refers to the Arabic, and have found that they agree with the Arabic of the Polyglot, but the number is not sufficient to lead to a positive conclusion. Mill however himself expressly declares, that he took his Arabic readings from the London Polyglot, and makes no exception to the Acts of the Apostles, Prolegom. § 1472. Besides, as in this very paragraph he acknowledges that he was unacquainted with Arabic, he could not possibly have used the edition of Erpenius, in which, if we except the title-page, the epistle dedicatory, and the preface, there is not a syllable of Latin in the whole work.

11. In his treatise de evangeliis Arabicis, sect. 7. 14, 15, 16. On the other side of the question may be consulted C. B. Michaelis Tractatio critica de variis lectionibus N. T. § 28. where examples are given in which the Arabic version of the four Gospels, printed at Rome and re-printed in the Polyglots, differs from that published by Erpenius.

PAGE 90.

12. Our author in this part of his *Orient. Bibl.* has printed the Arabic text of John v. 2. as it stands in the Roman, Polyglot, and Erpenian editions, in order to shew the necessity of distinguishing them in quoting the Arabic version. Now with respect to Mill, though his readings are here of little weight, as being taken from the Latin translation, yet he deserves not our author's censure in quoting simply Arabs, because he expressly declares that he means the Arabic of the London Polyglot. But still more extraordinary than his censure of former critics, is the total silence, which he observes in regard to the merits of Griesbach, whose Greek Testament was published ten years before the present edition of his Introduction, and who has very accurately distinguished the three texts by the marks Ar. Rom. Ar. Pol. and Erp. and likewise uses the abbreviation Arr. when all three coincide.

13. Storr on the contrary, in his treatise *de evangeliiis Arabicis*, § 35. concludes with Erpenius, that Nejulamam was the translator, namely of the Gospels. Of the other books of the N. T. Erpenius adds in his Preface, *Ceterum, an idem etiam reliquos libros verterit, non satis sum certus. Non puto: nam et phrasi nonnihil ab Evangeliiis discrepant, et Syro contextui quam Græco plerisque in locis videntur esse viciniore.*

PAGE 91.

14. This is the most plausible argument that has been alledged in support of the opinion, that the Arabic version of the Gospels was taken immediately from the Greek. But as the Roman, Polyglot, and Erpenian editions of the Gospels, contain the text of one and the same version, as our author and Dr. Storr assert, and the Polyglot editions have a pure Arabic expression, why may not the insertion of *Abrubathiki Kolimbithra*, which is found in the Roman and Erpenian editions, be ascribed to some interpolator, who was as anxious to retain Greek words as the author of the Philoxenian version? For
according

according to the above-mentioned hypothesis it necessarily follows, that either the Roman or the Polyglot reading, in the passage in question, is the result of an interpolation. It may indeed be objected, that Gabriel Sionita altered the text of the Roman edition to better Arabic, and that hence arose the reading found in the Polyglots; but as he corrected the Gospels by a manuscript brought from Egypt, who will undertake to determine that the alteration in this instance was without authority? Besides, as the manuscript used by Erpenius was brought from Egypt, it is at least possible that the Arabic version of the Gospels was made from some Coptic version, in which the Greek expression was retained, and this possibility alone is sufficient to render the argument inconclusive, with respect to its having been taken immediately from the Greek. This at least is certain, that the words *προβατικη κολυμβηθρα* are retained in the Coptic version published by Wilkins. It may also be observed, that the construction in the common printed Greek and Arabic texts is totally different. The former is *ἐν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολυμοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβηθρᾷ*, but in the Arabic no expression is used for *ἐπὶ τῇ*, and *προβατικῇ* is taken in the Nominative, to agree with *κολυμβηθρα*. Here then the Arabic imitates not the Greek, but the Vulgate, which has *Est autem Hierosolymis probatica piscina*. Lastly, in respect to the question, whether the printed Arabic version of the Gospels was taken from the Coptic, or the Greek, or perhaps the Syriac, it may be observed that Erpenius is of the same opinion with our author, and derives it from the Greek. But Le Long and Simon are of a different opinion. Le Long, after having quoted from the Preface of Erpenius the subscription to the Gospels, which has been given p. 90. in this volume of the Introduction to the N. T., adds, ‘*Rectius infert inde R. Simon, cap. 28. hist. crit. versionum N. T. hanc versionem ex Copticis, proindeque ex interpretatione Coptica, potius quam ex contextu Græco emanasse. Visa est tamen illi magis consentanea versioni*

versioni Arabicæ quæ adjicitur MSS. Syriacis quam ei, quæ MSS. Copticis respondet.

Le Long Bibl. sacra, Tom. I. p. 120. ed. 1723.

15. But if we therefore conclude that the Arabic version actually was made before the time of Mohammed, we are guilty of a *petitio principii*, and presuppose the thing to be proved. In a version of undoubted antiquity, modern words, which are accidentally found in it, must necessarily be ascribed to the interpolation of a later hand; but in a version like the Arabic, of which the antiquity is very uncertain, it is more reasonable to conclude, from expressions not used before the time of Mohammed, that the version itself, in which they are found, was written since that period, than to condemn without authority these expressions as spurious, in order to acquire an argument for the high antiquity of the version.

PAGE 92.

16. No part of the Arabic version has been so carefully examined as that of the Acts of the Apostles, according to the edition of Erpenius. Our author, in his *Curæ in versionem Syriacam actuum apostolicorum*, p. 14—42. has given a very accurate collation of the Erpenian Arabic version of the Acts, with the old Syriac version, from which the former manifestly appears, except in a few instances, to have been taken from the latter. For this careful examination he is entitled to the thanks of every critic, and if the other books of the Arabic version, or versions, of the N. T. were examined with the same care, some light might be thrown on a subject, which is at present involved in obscurity, as the Acts of the Apostles is the only part of the printed Arabic version, or versions of the N. T. on which we can pronounce with any certainty, as to the source, from which it was derived. Many Arabic manuscripts, both of the Old and New Testament, have subscriptions at the end, which express not only the year, in which they were written, but the language, from which they were translated. Unfortunately in the present instance, we are destitute of this aid, for we know nothing of the manuscripts

manuscripts from which the Roman edition, and the Paris Polyglot were printed, and all that appears from the subscription to the manuscript used by Erpenius, is that it was written in Egypt; but we can derive from it no certain inference, in respect to the original from which the translation was made.

17. 1 Pet. v. 3. in the Arabic version of Erpenius, can have been translated neither from the Greek, nor from the Syriac, for it has precisely the reading of the Vulgate, which differs both from the Greek word *κληρος*, and the Syriac *ܟܠܝܪܐ*. And what is still more extraordinary, the Arabic translator has taken the word 'clerus' of the Vulgate in its modern ecclesiastical sense. This is no very favourable appearance, either for the antiquity or critical value of the Arabic version of this epistle. In the Arabic of the Polyglots a different translation is given, but it is expressive of the same meaning, 'cleri' being there paraphrased by an expression signifying 'constituti in dignitatibus sacerdotii,' a paraphrase which favours of the Roman hierarchy, and is wholly unwarranted both by the Greek and by the Syriac. But as the printed Arabic version has, according to Storr, been much interpolated, it is more equitable to ascribe these readings to modern interpolations, than to condemn the whole epistle. And that neither the Erpenian, nor the Polyglot version of the Catholic epistles was translated from the Vulgate, appears from the omission of 1 John v. 7. as Walton has observed in his Prolegomen. xiv. § 23. unless we suppose that it was made from a MS. of the Vulgate, of which there are many, where that verse was omitted.

PAGE 93.

18. A copy of this scarce edition is preserved in the University Library in Cambridge, and marked Ee, 4, 44. and another in the library of St. John's College in Cambridge, where it is marked T, 5, 17.

PAGE 94.

19. Our author means the Paris edition of 1723, in two vols. folio; but in the improved edition by Dr. Masch,

Masch, more certain accounts are given of the Bukarest edition of the Arabic version, P. II. Vol. I. p. 117.; and he has likewise corrected an error, into which Professor Aurivillius had fallen.

20. Of these, as well as of the complete editions of the Arabic version, a description is given in Le Long *Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 110—137. For an account of the manuscripts of the Arabic version of the New Testament, preserved in the different libraries in Europe, see Boerner's edition of Le Long *Bibliotheca sacra*, P. I. p. 234—240. or Vol. I. p. 120—122. of the Paris edition of 1723; Uri's Catalogue, N°. 22—34. of the Arabic manuscripts, and Note 11. to sect. 3. of this chapter. In the University library at Cambridge are two Arabic MSS. of the Gospels, which formerly belonged to Cyrillus Lucaris. A catalogue of Arabic MSS. has lately been published in Spain, under the following title, *Biblioteca Española de Escritores Rabinos y Arabigos*, por D. Joseph. Castro. Madrid, 1788, 2 tom. folio. Casiri likewise published a Catalogue of Arabic MSS. in the Escorial, under the title, *Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana Escorialensis*, Madrid, 1760—1770, 2 tom. fol.; but I am not certain whether either of these two last-mentioned catalogues contain manuscripts of the Arabic version.

PAGE 95.

21. Not so those quoted by Griesbach, of whose merits our author makes no mention. See Note 12.

S E C T. XVII.

PAGE 96.

1. It is extraordinary that our author makes no mention of the celebrated Hiob Ludolf, or Leutholf, the father of Ethiopic literature in Europe, whose *Historia Æthiopica*, Francofurti 1681, fol. and *Commentarius ad suam historiam Æthiopicam*, Francofurti 1691, fol. contain

contain the most authentic accounts of the Ethiopic version. See also Waltoni Prol. xv.

2. What edition of Chrysostom's works our author means, I know not; but in that, which was published by Montfaucon, the passage, where Chrysostom speaks of the Ethiopic version, is Vol. VIII. p. 10. *Αλλ' ε τα τε ιδιωτε και αγραμματα ετως· αλλα και Συροι, και Αιγυπτιοι, και Ινδοι, και Περσαι, και Αιθιοπες, και μυρια ετερα εθνη, εις την αυτων μεταβαλλοντες γλωτταν, τα περι τετε δογματα εισαχθεντα, εμαθον ανθρωποι βαρβαροι φιλοσοφειν.* It may be observed that this passage relates to the Gospel of St. John: but it may be reasonably concluded, that if one Gospel was translated, the others would not have remained untranslated. Chrysostom has however weakened his own evidence in regard to the Ethiopic, or any one version in particular, by the addition of the clause *και μυρια ετερα εθνη.*

3. Of the author of the Ethiopic version of the N.T. we have no historical accounts. Some critics have conjectured that it was made by Frumentius, a bishop in the fourth century, who first preached Christianity in Ethiopia, to which opinion Mr. Bruce seems inclined to accede. See his Travels to discover the source of the Nile, Vol. I. Book II. chap. vi. p. 491. and Ludolfi Hist. Æthiopica, Lib. III. c. iv. But Ludolf adds as his opinion, 'id, priusquam videam, pro certo non affirmaverim,' though Mr. Bruce says, p. 490. 'the Abyssinian copy of the Holy Scriptures, was in Mr. Ludolf's opinion translated by Frumentius.' The Ethiopic version contains the whole of the N. T. which is divided into four separate parts. 1. The Gospels. 2. The Acts. 3. The fourteen epistles of St. Paul. 4. The seven catholic epistles. The Apocalypse is added as an appendix, and entitled Abukalamfis. Ludolf Hist. Æth. Lib. III. c. iv. n. 21.

4. C. B. Michaelis tractatio critica de var. lect. N. T. § 26.

5. In this reference to Griesbach's Symbolæ criticæ is an erratum, which I have not been able to correct. Perhaps our author means p. 76. and 77. where mention

tion is made of the readings of Origen, and those of the Coptic, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions.

6. The names of the editors who were natives of Ethiopia are mentioned in the Ethiopic subscription printed at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel, which Ludolf, in his *Comment. ad hist. Æthiop.* p. 294. has translated in the following manner, *Memores estote nostrum in orationibus vestris sanctis, scilicet fratrum vestrorum, Tesfa-Sionis Malhesini, Tensea-Waldi, et Zaslaski; Petri, et Pauli, et Bernardini; quoniam omnes nos filii fumus patris nostri Tecla Haimanoti, Monasterii Romani Mons Libani dicti.* Though six names are here mentioned, it must not be concluded that there were six editors, for the three first are Ethiopic, the three last, viz. Petrus, Paulus, Bernardinus, are only Latin names adopted by the three Ethiopic editors. See *Le Long Bib. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. I. p. 154.

7. At the end of the Acts of the Apostles, the editors added an Ethiopic subscription, which Ludolf, in his *Hist. Æthiop. Lib. III. cap. iv. num. 11.* translates as follows, *Ista Acta Apostolorum maxima sui parte versa sunt Romæ e linguâ Romanâ et Græcâ in Æthiopicam propter defectum archetypi: id, quod addidimus vel omisimus, condonate nobis, vos autem emendate illud.* It may be here observed, that the word *archetypum* can imply only a single manuscript, which is the source, therefore, from which all our editions of the Ethiopic version of the N. T. have flowed. It is probably preserved in the Vatican, though it does not appear that any one has ever given a description of it.

8. A more accurate Latin translation of the Ethiopic version has been published by Professor Bode under the following title, *Novum Testamentum ex versione Æthiopici interpretis in Bibliis polyglottis Anglicanis editum ex Æthiopicâ linguâ in Latinum translatum.* Brunsvigæ 1752, 1755, 2 tom. 4to.

PAGE 97.

9. This judgement seems to be too severe, for if the Ethiopic version was made immediately from the Greek,
and

and in an early age, if its readings coincide with the quotations of Origen, and the Greek MSS. of the Alexandrine edition, it seems to be entitled to the same privileges, as other versions of equal antiquity. The principal objection applies not so much to the version itself, as to our printed text, which is probably incorrect, as not being the result of a collation of different MSS. but the very same objection may be made to the old Syriac version, in which, though various MSS. have been used since the original edition of Widmanstad, the alterations that have been made deserve rather the name of corruptions, than of improvements. Griesbach, in his *Historia textus epistolarum Paulinarum*, Sect. 1. § 12. says, *Æthiopica et Armenica translationes, quarum neutra alii ulli postponenda est, puriores quidem quam Syriaca ad nos pervenerunt: attamen editorum fides non sine specie in dubium vocatur.* Ludolf likewise, in the preface to his *Ethiopic Lexicon*, published by Wansleb, at London in 1671, 4to. says, *Verendum est ne idem in cæteris Novi Testamenti libris fecerint, quippe Æthiops meus in multis eos differre aiebat ab exemplaribus MSS. patriæ suæ.*

10. This work was published at Halle in 1749, 4to. and is the same, as that to which our author alludes in the first paragraph.

11. Published at Halle in 1767 and 1769, in two vols. 8vo.

PAGE 98.

12. Mr. Bruce, in the chapter quoted Note 3. Vol. I. p. 489. relates, that he brought with him from Abyssinia a copy of the Ethiopic version of the Old Testament, which he has deposited in the British Museum, but it does not appear that he brought a copy of any part of the version of the New. He relates, Vol. I. B. II. Ch. 7. p. 493. that copies of the whole New Testament are even in that country extremely scarce, that except in the churches he had never seen a single manuscript which comprehended all the parts of it, and that even the transcripts of the Gospels were in the hands only of men

of the first distinction. Ludolf, in his *Commentar. Histor. Æthiop.* has given a catalogue of Ethiopic MSS. preserved in different libraries in Europe. See also *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Boerner. P. I. p. 158. or Vol. I. p. 130. ed. Paris. 1723. and Note II. to sect. 3. of this chapter.

S E C T. XVIII.

PAGE 98.

1. The title of this work is, *Mosis Chorenensis Historiæ Armeniacæ libri III.* Armeniace ediderunt, Latine verterunt, notisque illustrarunt, Gulielmus et Georgius, Gul. Whistoni filii, Aulæ Clarensis in Academia Cantabrigiensi aliquandiu alumni. Londini, 1736, 4to.

2. A much better description is given in *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Mafsch, P. II. Vol. I. sect. 9.

PAGE 99.

3. Published at Helmstädt in 1757, 4to.

PAGE 100.

4. This letter is also printed in the Preface to *Moses Chorenensis*, p. 9. and the English translation of it may be seen either in Bp. Watson's *Tracts*, Vol. III. p. 302. or p. 245. of the Cambridge edition of Beauobre and L'Enfant's Introduction, printed in 1779, 8vo.

PAGE 101.

5. This is probably an erratum for Eznac, or Eznic: the former orthography is adopted by Le Long, the latter by the Whistons, *Moses Choren*, p. 311.

6. Our author is not accurate in saying that the Syriac and Armenian are the only versions in which this addition is found, for it is likewise in the Persian. This however affects not his argument, as the Persian was taken from the Syriac.

PAGE 102.

7. Another argument which clearly decides in favour of the opinion that our present Armenian version was not taken

taken from the Syriac (that is, from the Peshito) is, that the former contains those books of the New Testament which were never admitted into the latter.

S E C T. XIX.

PAGE 103.

1. They are three distinct editions, for that of 1666, which contains both the Old and New Testament, is in 4to. that of 1668 which includes only the N. T. is in 8vo. and the edition of 1698 is in 12mo. The two first only were printed under the direction of Uscan, but the last is the most beautiful edition. A complete description, particularly of the first of these editions, is given in *Le Long Bib. sacra*, ed. Masch. P. II. Vol. I. p. 173—176. 180. A list of Armenian manuscripts of the New Testament is given in Dr. Boerner's edition of this work, P. I. p. 280. or Vol. I. p. 138. of the Paris edition of 1723. See also Vol. I. p. 76. of the *Catalogus MSS. Bib. Regiæ*, and Note 11. to sect. 3. of this chapter.

PAGE 104.

2. The words of Sandius are, *Codex præterea Armeniacus, ante 400 annos exaratus, quem vidi apud Episcopum ecclesiæ Armeniacæ, quæ Amstelodami colligitur, locum illum non legit.* Now our author speaks of this manuscript, as if it was the only one, that was used by the Armenian Bishop, but it is possible, and even probable, that Uscan had more than one manuscript, nor do the words of Sandius imply the contrary.

3. The words of La Croze are, *Ce verset ne se trouve point dans l'Armenien. Je parle ici de l'Armenien manuscrit; car l'Eveque Armenien Uscan l'a fourré dans les éditions de Hollande après l'avoir traduit sur le Latin de la Vulgate.* But La Croze, on reading the Acts of the Council of Sis (held in 1307) published by Galanus, altered his opinion as far as relates to Uscan. For on finding that this verse was quoted in the Acts of that

Council (unless it was inserted without authority by Galanus) he thought it probable that the manuscripts of the Armenian version, which were written since the time of Haitho, might contain that verse. But none of these modern manuscripts have been actually produced in favour of the opinion, whereas we have positive evidence that Armenian manuscripts, written before the time of this council, have not the verse. Thus far I had written in the first edition of these notes: but at present all doubts are removed on the subject, and we know to a certainty that *no* Armenian MS. of the N. T. has the verse. This appears from the following testimony of Professor Alter at Vienna, which he first gave in the Preface to his edition of the Iliad, p. 85. Plurimum Reverendus Bibliothecarius Meghitarensum, in insula S. Lazari Venetiis, P. Joannes Zohrab Armenus, Viennæ nunc (scil. 1790) negotia agens, mihi affirmavit, *se in nullo codice manuscripto Armeno Novi Testamenti, quos tamen multos et varios in Conventus bibliotheca habent, Job. v. 7. reperisse, illumque in nullo adhuc codice Armeno repertum fuisse.*

4. Since the publication of this Introduction, the four first chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel in the Armenian version have been very accurately collated by Bredencamp, and the collation is printed in our author's New Orient. Bib. Vol. VII. p. 142—154.

5. Præfatio ad Mosen Chorenensem, p. 16.

PAGE 105.

6. To the Armenian version may be added the Georgian, which was first printed at Moscow in 1743, fol. A description of it is given by the very learned and ingenious Eichhorn in his Allgemeine Bibliothek, or Universal Library of Biblical Literature, Vol. I. p. 153—169. The description is taken from an essay on the Georgian version, written in Georgian by a learned Armenian named Avutadil, and translated into Italian by Paolo Leone, who has the title Vescovo Ordinante per la Nazione Armena. This translation was brought by Profes-
for

for Adler from Rome. But as it appears from the description, that the Georgian text was altered from the Slavonian in the edition of Moscow, it would be of little value in the criticism of the New Testament. Two MSS. of the Georgian version of the Gospels are preserved in the Vatican. See Le Long Bib. sacra, Tom. I. p. 140. ed. Paris, 1723.

S E C T. XX.

PAGE 105.

1. A new Latin translation has been published by Professor Bode, at Helmstädt in 1750, 1751, with a preface containing historical and critical remarks on the Perfic versions.

2. These notes are printed in the Appendix to the London Polyglot, p. 57—98. The Perfic version of the four Gospels, which is the only part of the N. T. hitherto printed, was taken for the edition of the London Polyglot from a MS. in the possession of Dr. Pococke, and written in the year 1341. See Waltoni Proleg. XVI. § 9. It was the Codex Pocockianus 126, and is numbered 5453 in the Catalogi Lib. MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti. Tom. I. P. I. p. 275. for this is the only Perfic MS. of the Gospels mentioned in Pococke's catalogue.

PAGE 106.

3. In Pierſon's preface to this edition is the following passage, Cum Evangeliiſ Perſicis edendis D. Abraham Whelocus operam navaffet, tres ſibi MSS. codices impetraverat, Oxoniensem, Cantabrigienſem, et alterum Pocockianum; quorum uno deſcripto, cæteris collatis, ſuſiorem in omnes commentarium deſtinaverat. Now Walton, in his 16th Prolegomenon, § 9. relates that he himſelf had knowledge of only three MSS. of the Perſic Gospels, one in the poſſeſſion of Dr. Pococke, the other

two in the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge; the first of which was printed in the London Polyglot, is a version different from the two last, and was supposed by Walton to be more ancient. If this account be true, Wheloc must have used manuscripts containing distinct versions; his text therefore is of a mixed nature, and of less value in that respect, as well as in point of antiquity, than that of the Polyglot. Of these three MSS. of the Persian Gospels, used by Wheloc, the Cod. Cantabrigiensis is probably that which is at present marked in the University library Gg. 5. 26. for though there is another Persian MS. of the Gospels in the same library, yet that belonged formerly to Bp. Moore, and was not brought to Cambridge till sixty years after the death of Wheloc. Le Long, in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 134. says that the Cambridge MS. used by Wheloc is preserved in the library of Emmanuel College: But I have examined this MS. and found that it did not belong to Emmanuel college till the year 1681, twenty-four years after the Persian Gospels were printed; for in a blank leaf at the beginning of the MS. is written, *Coll. Em. Cant. Ex dono Richardi Kidder hujus collegii quondam focii*, 1681. The Codex Oxoniensis it is more difficult to determine. Uri, in his Catalogue of Oriental manuscripts in the Bodleian library, enumerates only two Persian manuscripts of the Gospels, viz. p. 270. noted by him 6 and 7. the one formerly in the possession of Laud, the other formerly the property of Hyde. Le Long decides in favour of the former, and in Uri's description of it we find the words *Versio ad verba et mentem Græci textus concinnata*, which words are used by Pierfon in the title-page. But in favour of the other manuscript it may be said, that Pierfon has likewise in the title-page the following remarkable clause, *Versio Persica Arabicam et Syriacam redolens*, which very words are used by Uri in his description of his Codex 7. among the Persian manuscripts, and they were probably written by some proprietor in a blank leaf of the manuscript itself. The Codex Pocockianus has been mentioned in the preceding note.

4. There

4. There are two title pages to Wheloc's edition, one by Wheloc himself, the other added by Pierſon. The former is *quatuor Evangelia Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti Perſice, ad numerum ſitumque verborum Latine data*. 1652. The other is *Quatuor Evangeliorum Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti verſio Perſica, Syriacam et Arabicam ſuaviſſime reddens: ad verba et mentem Græci textus fideliter et venuſte concinnata*. Londini 1657. It ſeems therefore that Pierſon, not Wheloc, was of opinion that this Perſic verſion was made from the Greek: or rather it was the opinion of ſome former proprietor of one of the manuſcripts uſed by Wheloc, as the words 'ad verba et mentem Græci textus concinnata' were probably written on a blank leaf of the manuſcript itſelf.

5. A liſt of manuſcripts of the Perſic verſion of the New Teſtament is given in *Le Long Bibliotheca ſacra*, ed. Boerner. P. I. p. 168—170. or Vol. I. p. 133, 134. ed. Pariſ. 1723.

S E C T. XXI.

PAGE 108.

1. As our preſent Engliſh tranſlation of the Bible was made in the time of James I. by a ſociety of forty ſeven perſons appointed for that purpoſe by royal authority, who were divided into ſix different companies, which met in Weſtminſter, Oxford, and Cambridge, and none of them probably were ſufficiently acquainted with the German to derive any aſſiſtance from Luther's tranſlation, it may ſeem difficult to comprehend how the Germaniſms, of which our author ſpeaks, ſhould have been derived from this ſource: and it may appear more reaſonable to conclude, that thoſe turns of expreſſion, which are no longer current in modern writings, were remnants of the Anglo-ſaxon idiom, of which more traces are viſible in the works of that age, than in thoſe of the preſent century. But it appears from the following circumſtances, that our author's aſſertion is not wholly devoid of foundation. 1. Luther published his German tranſlation of the

the New Testament in 1523. 2. A few years previous to this publication William Tyndal, who had studied both in Oxford and Cambridge, went abroad, spent some time in Germany, was personally acquainted with Luther, settled afterwards in Antwerp, and published an English Translation of the N. T. in 1526. 3. John Rogers, who had studied in Cambridge, and spent a considerable time in Germany, where he became a minister of a Lutheran congregation, translated that part of the Old Testament which Tyndal had left unfinished, revised his translation of the New, added notes and prefaces from Luther, and published the whole at Hamburg in 1537, which edition is commonly called *Matthewe's Bible*, *Matthewe* being a fictitious name assumed by Rogers. 4. It is certain therefore that Rogers made use of Luther's version; and it is highly probable that Tyndal did the same, as he first translated those books which Luther had first translated, and began the translation of the prophets only a short time before his death in 1536, which Luther had not finished before 1532. Lastly it appears from the 14th Rule given by James I. to the translators of our present English Bible, that where the English translations of Tyndal, *Matthewe*, &c. by which last is meant the edition of 1537, came closer to the original than the *Bishop's Bible*, their mode of translation should be retained.

See *Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica*, Tom. IV. p. 82. and Johnson's historical account of the English translations of the Bible, in *Bishop Watson's Tracts*, Vol. III. p. 67—72. 94—96. See also p. 309. of the preceding work, and Vol. I. p. 418. of *Le Long Bib. sacra*, ed. Paris. 1723.

S E C T. XXII,

PAGE 109.

1. The *Evangeliarium quadruplex* of Blanchini consists of two parts, and though it is generally bound in four volumes, yet in quoting it reference is commonly made

made to the part, not to the volume, because the pages are numbered through each part without interruption. A description of the manuscripts used by Blanchini is given by Dr. Semler in his Appendix to Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 635—678.

2. To the MSS. used by Blanchini, may be added a MS. in the imperial library at Vienna, containing parts of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels according to the old Latin version. A complete description has been given of it in Latin by Professor Alter, and published in the third volume of the New Repertorium of Professor Paulus, p. 115—170.

PAGE III.

3. The reading of the later version, or the Vulgate, is Euroaquilo, whence probably our author conjectures, that the Greek MSS. from which this version was made, had *Ευρακυλων*, the reading of the Cod. Alexandrinus.

4. To the editions of the old Latin version, either of the whole or of part of it mentioned by our author, may be added Dr. Semler's edition of the Latin text of the Gospel of St. John, taken from the Codex Cantabrigiensis. It is printed with his Paraphrasis Evangelii Johannis, 2 tom. 1771, 1772. 8vo. and it will shortly be published by Dr. Kipling, with types resembling the original. For further information on this subject, see Le Long Biblioth. sacra, ed. Masch. P. II. Vol. III. cap. i.

S E C T. XXIII.

PAGE II2.

1. As the Latin translation was added in order to render the original more intelligible to the inhabitants of those countries, in which Greek was not spoken, it is natural to suppose, that the translation would be adapted to the original, not the original to the translation; and it seems extraordinary, for this very reason, that the latter conjecture could ever occur to a critic so eminent as Wetstein.

2. It

2. It is not impossible that some of these Latin versions were written several centuries after the commencement of Christianity. It is the generally received opinion that the Latin versions, found in the *Codices Græco-Latini*, as well as those published by Blanchini, existed in their present form, before the age of Jerom. But no satisfactory proof has ever been given of this assertion; for though the quotations of Lucifer of Cagliari, and other Latin fathers, who lived before the time of Jerom, frequently coincide with the text of some one of these translations, yet on the other hand they frequently disagree, as Simon himself acknowledges in his *Nouvelles Observations*, P. II. ch. xxi. No one will deny that a Latin version or versions of the New Testament existed, not only in the fourth, but even before the close of the second century, as appears from the quotations of Tertullian. See Semler's Appendix to Wetstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 584. of the ed. published at Halle in 1764. But who will undertake to determine, that the version quoted by Tertullian, is among the number of those which exist at present? The *Codices Græco-Latini* were in general written after the age of Jerom, (see Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, Lib. III. cap. 1, 2, 3, 4.) at a time when the authority of the Vulgate had in a great measure, though not entirely, superseded the use of the more ancient versions. The Latin versions therefore annexed to the Greek texts of these manuscripts, for the private use of those, who were unable to understand the original without the help of a translation, may be considered, not indeed as original productions of those ages, in which the *Codices Græco-Latini* were transcribed, but as compositions adapted to the text of each particular manuscript. If this statement be true, the Latin versions in the *Codices Græco-Latini* have a mixed text, which is composed partly of Ante-Hieronymian readings, partly of readings of the Vulgate, and partly of readings which were borrowed from the particular Greek text, to which they were added.

PAGE 113.

3. 'Itala' is perhaps an erratum in the manuscripts of Augustin's works for 'illa,' and perhaps the genuine reading is, 'in ipsis autem interpretationibus illa cæteris præferatur,' &c. This conjecture was made by Bentley, defended by Casley, and adopted by Lardner, Ernesti, and other eminent critics. See the arguments in support of the reading 'illa,' in Lardner's Works, Vol. V. p. 116. ed. 1788, and Ernesti Institutio interpretis N. T. p. 121. ed. 1775. If this conjecture is grounded, the error was occasioned by a transcriber, who read ITLA for ILLA, and supposed it to be an abbreviation of ITALA. But there is an inconvenience attending this conjecture, which consists in the word 'nam,' because if Itala be altered to illa, and the sentence be written 'in ipsis autem interpretationibus illa cæteris præferatur, *nam* est verborum tenacior,' &c. there is something wanting to determine the sense of 'illa:' and if, in order to effect this purpose, we change 'nam' into 'quæ,' as some critics have done who defend the reading 'illa,' we take a liberty which is wholly unwarranted. To avoid therefore the necessity of so violent an alteration, another ingenious conjecture was proposed by Potter. He supposes that Itala is a mistake for usitata, and that the passage stood originally; as written in the most ancient manuscripts, as follows, INIPSIS AUTEM INTERPRETATIONIBUS USITATA CAETERIS PRAEFERATUR, &c.; that a transcriber, after having copied 'interpretationibus,' took the first syllable of usitata, on returning to his manuscript, for the last syllable of the word, which he had just written, and of course read the next word ITATA, which he concluded to be an erratum for ITALA, and in this manner produced our present spurious reading.

S E C T. XXIV.

PAGE 114.

1. One might almost suspect that translations, which abound in barbarisms of this nature, were written in the ages of ignorance, and after Latin had ceased to be a living language.

2. Our author, consistently with his favourite hypothesis, explains as provincialisms these deviations from classic purity. But whatever latitude be allowed to this principle, it seems to be insufficient to explain such examples as 'unus scriba,' where the use of *unus*, not as an adjective of number, but as an article, is so contrary to the genius of the Latin language, that it could never have been admitted, even in the most distant provinces, as long as Latin was a living language. It is an idiom peculiar to the dialects of the North, and could never have occurred to any Latin writer before the ancient tribes of Germany, after their conquests of Italy had engrafted their language on the Latin, and produced the modern Italian. In short, 'unus scriba' is nothing more than the German *ein schreiber*, and the Italian *uno scriba*, and implies a familiarity with these expressions. These observations are made on the supposition, that our author is right in saying, that in the expressions *unus scriba*, *unus princeps*, &c. the word 'unus' is used as a modern indeterminate article, like the Italian 'uno.' But it was probably used as an indefinite pronoun, and as synonymous to 'quidam,' in the same manner as *εις* is sometimes used for *τις*: since *unus scriba*, Matth. viii. 19. (not. vii. 19. as in the German original, an erratum, which by accident I neglected to alter in the translation) is literally translated from *τις γραμματευσ*; and with respect to *princeps unus*, Matth. ix. 18. though *αρχων* alone is found in the common editions, yet several manuscripts quoted by Wetstein have *αρχων τις*, and one has *αρχων εις*. See Gesner's *Thesaurus*, art. *Unus*, where Gesner quotes 'unus pater familias,' from Cicero de Oratore.

PAGE

PAGE 115.

3. Salmacidus is not quoted by Cicero from Ennius, for the line which he quotes is the following:

Salmaci, da spolia sine sudore et sanguine.

De Officiis, Lib. I. c. 18.

It may be observed, that this example must not be sought in the Vulgate, where we find a different expression, James iii. 11. but in the old Latin version published by Sabatier. Matth. iii. 24. is an erratum in the German original for Matth. iv. 24. which is not altered in the translation, because, though I knew it to be an error, I had not discovered the real place, till after that page had been already printed.

4. See Note 2.

PAGE 116.

5. The first example, which our author produces in favour of his hypothesis, that one of the old Latin versions was made by a native Syrian, is taken from Mark i. 9. where the Codd. Vercellensis and Veronensis for ab Johanne have ab Johannen. The origin of this termination he seeks in the Syriac version, in which Johannes is expressed by ܝܫܫܢܐ (Juhanan); but it is surely more reasonable to ascribe it to the ignorance of a copyist in later ages; who knew not whether 'ab' governed an ablative, or an accusative. It is therefore mere accident that the proper name in question ends in both versions with the same letter. Besides, if the Syriac has been the cause of these solæcisms, how shall we explain the origin of Scriptum est in Ezechiam prophetam, which is found in the Cod. Vercellensis, Mark i. 1. (Evangeliarium quadruplex, P. II. p. 310.) for, in Ezechia propheta. In Syriac Ezechias is expressed by ܝܫܫܝܐ (Esehjo): the false government therefore observable in the Latin, cannot possibly be ascribed to any other cause, than the ignorance of the writer or transcriber. The other examples are selected, with a view of shewing what our author asserts in this paragraph, that there are Syriacisms in the Latin

Latin versions, where none are observable in the Greek, and that these idioms are to be ascribed to a native of Syria, who, in translating the Greek Testament into Latin, derived assistance from the version of his own country. The following may serve as a specimen. Mark viii. 17. the common Greek text is *πεπωρωμενην εχετε την καρδιαν υμων*, which, expressed word for word, is obtusum habetis cor vestrum; but the Latin versions in the Codex Cant. and the Brixienfis have *obtusa sunt corda vestra*. Now the use of the verb ‘sum’ instead of ‘habeo,’ our author says must be ascribed to the Syriac version, which has here *ܕܠܗܝܢ ܕܠܗܝܢ ܕܠܗܝܢ ܕܠܗܝܢ* cor durum est vobis. But what necessity is there for having recourse to the Syriac version, to explain the origin of a phrase, which, instead of being a Syriasm, is better Latin than the literal translation of the Greek? And whoever examines his other examples, will find that they may be all explained, without having recourse to a version, which was perhaps unknown, or at least unintelligible to the authors of these Latin translations. The example which our author alleges in the note from Ridley’s Dissertation is inconclusive, as he himself acknowledges.

PAGE 117.

6. If Jewish converts, inhabitants of Italy in the first century, had applied themselves to the translation of any part of the Greek Testament into Latin, which is however mere conjecture, it would be still insufficient to explain what our author asserts with respect to the Syriasm of these Latin versions, since the Jews of those ages who lived in Europe spake no other language than the Greek, and could read the Old Testament only in the Septuagint. If it be replied that a native of Syria might have settled in Rome, and applied himself to the task of translating Greek into Latin, a matter which is in itself almost incredible, we may answer, that no Christian community, either in Rome or any other city of Italy, would have accepted such a translation, where persons could not have been

been wanting, who were able to translate the original into correct and genuine Latin.

7. The examples, which our author has alleged in his *Curæ*, as proofs that Syriacisms are contained in the Latin versions, where none are observable in the Greek, are not wholly satisfactory. One of them has been mentioned in the fifth Note, which no more deserves the name of a Syriacism, than the expression used in the Syriac version the title of a Latinism. That a literal translation of the Greek Testament, which is full of Oriental idioms, as being written by natives of the East, should have the same peculiarities, as the original, is by no means extraordinary: and if in some examples expressions are discovered in the Latin versions, which favour of the Eastern idiom, where the Greek phrase is pure and classical, is it not more reasonable, as the translations were made in countries where Syriac was unknown, to ascribe them to the influence of habit acquired by the daily study of a work that is written in Syriac-Greek? The examples of coincidence between the Syriac and the Vulgate, in readings which are found in no Greek manuscript now extant, afford no proof that the one was either taken from, or even consulted in the composition of the other, and shew only that they were translated from Greek manuscripts written in an early age, before length of time had introduced the present variety.

S E C T XXV.

PAGE 117.

1. Our author here discovers in the Latin versions a knowledge of orthographical minutiae, in regard to Syriac proper names, where no such knowledge is visible. That Capernaum is used in some of them instead of Capernaum is by no means extraordinary, since *καπερναυμ* is found in Greek manuscripts, and was perhaps the most ancient reading, as it is thus quoted by Origen. Scarioth by no means corresponds to the Syriac orthography,

graphy, which is Scariuto, and this word is so differently written in the Latin versions, in some Iscariotes, in others Scariotes, in others again Scarioth, and lastly, in the Cod. Veronensis Carioth, that no inference can be deduced from it. At all events there is no necessity for referring to the Syriac, since Σκαριωτης is a various reading in the Greek; and even were this reading not in the Greek, why cannot a Latin translator have dropped the initial vowel without the intervention of the Syriac, as well as the Syriac translator without the intervention of the Latin? It is an oversight which is naturally to be expected from an inhabitant as well of ancient as of modern Italy, for the number of words which begin with Sc, both in Latin and Italian, greatly surpasses the number of those, which begin with Sc preceded by a vowel. With respect to the testimony of Augustin, no inference can be deduced from it that Latin versions were made in the first century, for the *prima fidei tempora*, of which he speaks, may relate to the second, as well as the first century.

PAGE 118.

2. The learned and ingenious Eichhorn, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, supposes with more probability that the first Latin version of the Bible was made in Africa, where Latin alone being understood, a translation was more necessary, where the Latin version was held in the highest veneration, and where the language being spoken with less purity, barbarisms might have more easily been introduced, than in a provincial town in Italy.

3. But the Greek Testament could not have been translated into Latin before the canon had been formed, which was certainly not made in the first century. See Millii Prolegomena, § 195. Semleri Commentarii historici de antiquo Christianorum statu, Tom. I. p. 35—39. and Griesbachii Historia textus epistolarum Paulinarum, sect. 2. § 12.

S E C T. XXVI.

PAGE 120.

I. It appears, from the fac simile which the editor of the Cod. Boernerianus has annexed to fol. 23. that distinct intervals are between each word; Phil. ii. 4. the reading is distinctly *εκαστοις κοπυντες*, and the Latin translation is *singuli laborantes*. The copyist therefore in transcribing from a more ancient manuscript, written without intervals, having by a false division of the two Greek words converted *σκοπυντες* into *κοπυντες*, altered in consequence of this error the Latin *considerantes* into *laborantes*. But his alteration is incomplete and inconsistent, for he should have changed at the same time *singuli* into *singulis*.

S E C T. XXVII.

PAGE 123.

I. Wettstein, in quoting from the Latin versions which differ from the Vulgate, quotes them indiscriminately under the title *Codices Latini*, but Griesbach has made a very accurate distinction between each individual manuscript, which he quotes by name, and of which he has given a catalogue to the number of seventeen. See his Preface, p. 23, 24. In short, he has shewn himself in this, as well as in every other respect, to be the most consummate critic, that ever undertook an edition of the Greek Testament. To the readings of Latin manuscripts which he has given in this admirable work, may be added those of the *Codex Evangeliorum Latinus Harleii*, and *Codex Epistolarum Latinus Harleii*, which he has communicated in his *Synbolæ Criticæ*, p. 307—382.

S E C T. XXVIII.

PAGE 123.

1. See Millii Prolegomena, § 850—869.

PAGE 124.

2. Examples are given in Wettstein's Prolegomena, p. 83.
3. For a description of the Divina Bibliotheca Hieronymi, see Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. III. cap. 1. § 18. or Walchii Bibl. patrística, p. 346.

S E C T. XXIX.

PAGE 125.

1. This is asserted by Mill in his Prolegomena, § 1401. With respect to our author's Note at the bottom of the page, where he produces a passage from Theganus, to shew that Charlemagne collated the Latin Gospels both with the Greek and with the Syriac, I must confess that I have not sufficient confidence in the authority of Theganus, to believe that Charlemagne, or even his secretary Alcuin, understood a syllable of Syriac. It is probable that neither of them understood much of the Greek language, which in those days was very little known in the West of Europe.

PAGE 126.

2. A description of a manuscript of the Vulgate, written in the 13th. century, is given in the Repertorium, Vol. XVII. p. 183—206. under the title Notitia codicis manuscripti membranacei e sæculo 13^{mo}. totius vulgatæ versionis bibliorum SS. proposita a C. L. Bauero. For a general description of the manuscripts of the Latin version, see Le Long Bibl. sacra, ed. Boerner, P. I. p. 534—574. or Vol. I. p. 234—250. ed. Paris. 1723.

PAGE

PAGE 127.

3. A complete account of all the editions of the Vulgate is given in *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. III. cap. 2.

S E C T. XXXI.

PAGE 130.

1. This is an original German name, and is the diminutive of the word Wolf: it is written in correct German Wölfelein, but corruptly pronounced Wölfila, or Wulfila, in the dialects of Switzerland, Bavaria, and Austria, to which that of the Mæso-Goths, who likewise inhabited the banks of the Danube, is nearly allied.

PAGE 131.

2. See also Lardner's Works, Vol. IV. p. 137. ed. 1788.

PAGE 132.

3. The works of Simeon Metaphrastes, who was born in Constantinople at the end of the ninth century, were published at Paris in 1556, 8vo.

PAGE 133.

4. The German title of this small treatise is Versuch einer Erläuterung einer alten Spur der Gothischen Uebersetzung; it was published at Halle in 1764.

S E C T. XXXIII.

PAGE 139.

1. To place this dispute in a clear point of view, it is necessary to observe, that the expression 'German language,' taken in its most extensive sense, (or, as we say, 'Teutonic') and as used by Fulda, Adelung, and others, who have the most profound knowledge of its

antiquity, includes not only the dialects of modern Germany, but all those languages which are spoken from the provinces on the southern banks of the Danube, to the borders of the Frozen Sea. It is divided into two principal classes, the High and the Low German: the former comprehends all those dialects, which are spoken in Upper Saxony, Franconia, Suabia, the circle of the upper Rhine, Switzerland, Bavaria, Austria, and in ancient times from the source to the mouth of the Danube: probably therefore in the country inhabited by the Mæso-Goths. The second class, or the Low German, comprehends the dialects of Lower Saxony, and Westphalia, the Danish, Swedish, or, as it may be called, Suio-Gothic, in opposition to Mæso-Gothic, Icelandic, Flemish, Dutch, and English, as spoken before it was mixed with Norman-French. This distinction being made, it will appear that many of the arguments used in the controversy, relative to the language of the Codex Argenteus, are merely verbal, and that the opposite parties frequently agree, where they seem to differ. And, what is still more unfortunate, the neglect of this distinction has led to very false conclusions: for instance, a similarity between the language of the Codex Argenteus, and that of the modern High German, has been used as an argument, that the version must be Frankish, as if the language of the old inhabitants of Mæsia were not a dialect of the High German, as well as the Frankish; and on the other hand, a similarity with the Swedish has been used as an argument, that the version is Gothic, as if Suio-Gothic and Mæso-Gothic were the same.

2. The Danes and the Swedes have an indefinite article *en* for the masculine, *et* for the neuter: but when the article is intended to be used definitely, they write it as a termination of the noun, to which it belongs. This peculiarity being not observable in the Codex Argenteus, is an argument that its dialect is not that of the Suio-Goths; but it leaves the question undecided, whether it be Mæso-Gothic, or Frankish.

3. With

3. With this difference, that the Swedes and the Danes never prefix the syllable *ge* or *ga* to the participle, whereas it is sometimes prefixed to it in the *Codex Argenteus*. See p. 49. of Lye's Gothic Grammar, prefixed to his edition of the Gothic version.

4. The formation of German verbs, by prefixing the syllable *ge*, is not peculiar to the dialect of Thuringen, or the writings of Ottfried, but is extremely common in all the dialects of the High German; and a great number of examples are given by Adelung, in his German Dictionary, Vol. II. p. 434. whereas this mode of formation is not used in the Danish or Swedish. Now as the syllable *ga*, which is only a less refined pronunciation, is incessantly applied in this manner in the *Codex Argenteus*, it affords a very strong presumption that its language is not Suio-Gothic, but like the argument mentioned, Note 2. it leaves the question undecided, whether the version was written in the country of the Franks, or in the ancient province of Mœtia.

S E C T. XXXIV.

PAGE 142.

1. The arguments used in this paragraph sufficiently evince that the dialect of the *Codex Argenteus* is that of a nation which, like the Mœso-Goths, bordered on the Greek empire, and therefore not the dialect of the Franks. But it must not be forgotten that the Mœso-Gothic is still a German dialect; it has a verb *Haban* (*habere*), as well as other dialects their *Haben*, and if *Haban* occurs in no instance of the *Codex Argenteus* as an auxiliary, it must be ascribed to the circumstance, that this version is a close copy of the Greek, and that the past time can be expressed in all the German dialects, both with and without the auxiliary. To the influence of the Greek may be likewise ascribed the use of the Dual, and of most, though not all of those words of the *Codex Argen-*

teus, which were never used by those German tribes, that were unconnected with foreigners.

2. The Mœso-Gothic is not the only German dialect in which this word is used. See Lye's Saxon Dictionary art. Sweitan, and Ihre Glossarium Suio-Gothicum art. Swaelta.

3. See the Preface to Ihre Glossarium Suio-Gothicum, p. 6. But many of the words, that are quoted by Busbeck, approach much nearer to the modern German, than to the language of the Codex Argenteus, and are rather to be ascribed to the Saxon colonies that were planted in Transylvania and in the neighbouring provinces, some centuries ago, than to be considered as remnants of the Mœso-Gothic.

PAGE 143.

4. These Latin words may be ascribed to the influence of the Roman colony, which Trajan planted in Dacia.

5. In the Gothic version *wdap* is invariably translated by the original German word 'wato,' but Luke vi. 49, where *ποταμος* is translated by 'flodus,' the word 'aqha' (qh corresponds to the Gothic *Q*) is written in the margin, but with what intent it is difficult to determine. In the printed editions of the Gothic version it is taken into the text, and compounded with 'flodus.'

6. See Fabricii Bibl. Græca, Vol. VI. p. 599.

PAGE 144.

7. See also Semleri interpretatio loci in Cærimoniali Byzantino, qui το Γόθικον commemorat. Halæ 1749, 4to.

8. But the arguments, which our author has already produced, are sufficiently convincing, that the version, contained in the Codex Argenteus, was not written within the limits of Germany, properly so called, and that it is exactly such as might be expected from a German tribe, which was settled on the borders of the Greek empire, and in the neighbourhood of a Roman colony.

S E C T. XXXVI.

PAGE 152.

1. These words are not in the edition of the Gothic version published by Junius and Marshall, nor in that printed at Stockholm, but they may be seen in *Ihre Ulphilas illustratus*, p. 67. ed. Büschen. In Benzel's edition, published by Lye at Oxford in 1750, they are restored to the Gothic text: on which Benzel observes in his note to this passage, 'Evidens legisse nostrum *οδεις γαρ εις ανθρωπων ος μη ποιη δυναμιν εν τω ονοματι μω*, at mirum est nullius nec codicis nec versionis consensum reperiri, quod haud dubie movit Junium, ut verba lectu clarissima ex editione sua expungeret.'

PAGE 153.

2. Various readings from the Gothic version were first quoted by Fell in the Oxford edition of 1675, others were added by Mill, and still more by Wettstein.

S E C T. XXXVII.

PAGE 155.

1. See Semleri dissertatio de primis initiis Christianæ inter Russos religionis, Halæ 1763, 4to.

PAGE 156.

2. A new edition of the Slavonian version was published at Moscow in 1783, 4to.

3. It is well known that this passage is omitted in most of the Greek manuscripts. See Griesbach in loco.

PAGE 157.

4. This verse is omitted in many Greek manuscripts,
R 1 4 among

among which are three in uncial letters, and also in several antient versions. The Cod. Bezaë is here defective.

PAGE 158.

5. Some few readings of the Slavonian version are given by Wettstein and Griesbach, for instance Acts xx. 28. but very copious and accurate extracts have been given from it by Professor Alter, in his edition of the Greek Testament, published at Vienna in 1787, Vol. I. p. 375—390. where the readings are taken from the edition printed at Moscow in 1614: p. 1122—1156. where they are taken from a Slavonian manuscript in the imperial library marked 356, and p. 1157—1194. likewise from a Slavonian manuscript in the same library marked 355. These relate to the four Gospels. Vol. II. p. 968—1039. are extracts from the Acts and the Epistles, from a Slavonian manuscript marked in the imperial library 101.

6. Since the publication of our author's Introduction, a very excellent description of the Slavonian version has been communicated by Dobrowsky, a profoundly learned critic in that branch of criticism, and printed in the Neue Orientalische Bibliothek, Vol. VII. p. 155—167. Of this essay the following are a few extracts. 1. The Slavonian version is very literally translated from the Greek, the Greek construction being frequently retained where it is contrary to the genius of the Slavonian; and resembles in general the most ancient manuscripts. 2. In the Gospels it agrees with the Codex Stephani, more frequently than with any other Greek manuscript. 3. In the catholic epistles it agrees in general with the Codex Alexandrinus, and frequently in the Revelation. 4. In the Acts, and in the epistles of St. Paul, it agrees in general with the most ancient manuscripts, but sometimes with one, sometimes with another, yet most frequently with Wettstein's Codex E. 5. Of the readings adopted by Griesbach in the text of his Greek Testament, the Slavonian version has at least three-fourths. 6. Where the united evidence of ancient manuscripts is against the

the common printed reading, the Slavonian version agrees with the ancient manuscripts. 7. It has not been altered from the Vulgate, as some have supposed, though the fact is in itself almost incredible. 8. It varies from the text of Theophylact, in as many instances as they agree: and their coincidence is to be ascribed, not to an alteration from Theophylact, but to the circumstance, that both Theophylact and the author of the Slavonian version used the Greek edition. 9. The Slavonian version has few or no readings peculiar to itself, or what the critics call ‘lectiones singulares.’

Dobrowsky adds, that the extracts made by Alter from the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, are selected with great accuracy, but that those which Matthæi has taken from the Revelation are erroneous and useless.

S E C T. XXXVIII.

PAGE 158.

1. See also Simon Hist. crit. des versions du N. T. ch. xlii. Our author, in referring to Le Long’s Bibliotheca sacra, means Vol. I. of the Paris edition of 1723. In Dr. Boerner’s edition, the account of the Anglo-saxon version is given P. II. p. 302—316.

2. The edition of 1571 was printed in London, in 4to. and has a preface by John Fox, which is dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. The edition of 1638 was likewise printed in London, and contains fragments both of the Old and New Testament. The edition of 1665 was printed at Dordrecht, with the Mæso-Gothic version, and re-printed at Amsterdam in 1684.

3. See Millii Prolegomena, § 1401.

PAGE 159.

4. Various readings from the Anglo-saxon version of the four Gospels were first quoted by Mill, who took them from the papers of Marshall. See his Prolegomena, § 1462.

§ 1462. With respect to its antiquity, the learned are not agreed, but it is generally referred to some part of the eighth century. For an account of the manuscripts of the Anglo-saxon version, see *Le Long Bibliotheca sacra*, Tom. I. p. 422, 423. ed. 1723. A very complete catalogue of Anglo-saxon manuscripts in general is given in Wanley's Appendix to Hickes's *Thesaurus*, published at Oxford in 1705, folio.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the manuscripts of the Greek Testament.

S E C T. I.

PAGE 159.

1. A codex criticus is a manuscript, in which the transcriber, instead of copying from one and the same ancient manuscript, selects from several those readings, which to him appear to be the best.

PAGE 160.

2. See also the Prolegomena to Professor Birch's edition of the four Gospels, published at Copenhagen in 1788, in which the learned editor has described a very great number, particularly of the manuscripts preserved in the libraries of Italy, which before his time had been either totally neglected, or very imperfectly examined. Professor Alter has likewise communicated extracts from Vienna manuscripts, in his edition of the Greek Testament published at Vienna in 1787. See Vol. I. p. 323—1078. Vol. II. p. 415—967.

S E C T.

S E C T. II.

PAGE 161.

1. See Mill's Prolegomena, § 1052—1057. But to prevent confusion it is necessary to observe, that *ο αποστολος* is frequently used in a different sense, denoting not a collection of lessons from the epistles, but the epistles themselves. See Griesbach's *Historia textus epistolarum Paulinarum*, sect. 2. § 10. Those manuscripts, which contain lessons from the four Gospels, are called in general *Evangelistaria*. See Wetstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 62.

2. This manuscript belonged formerly to Cæsar de Missy, and will be described in a subsequent section, under the title *Codex Goettingensis 2*. A transcript of the list of lessons from our author's *Or. Bibl.* would be foreign to the present purpose.

3. Because additions of this kind might be more easily admitted into a *Lectioarium*, than into a regular transcript of the Greek Testament. Their non admission therefore is a stronger proof against their authenticity, in the former case, than in the latter.

PAGE 162.

4. To render this example more intelligible, it may be observed that the genuine text of this passage, and which Griesbach has restored, is *κραβηνλος δε αυτε τον Πειρον και Ιωαννην*, but that in several *Lectioaria* a new lesson begins with *Acts iii. 11.* and in the following manner, *Εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις κραβηνλος τε ιαθενλος χωλε, κ.τ.λ.* Now the insertion of *τε ιαθενλος χωλε* was necessary in the beginning of the lesson, in order to inform the audience of the subject of discourse; but in the third chapter of the *Acts*, in which mention had been already made of the healing of the lame man, *αυτε* was sufficient, and *τε ιαθενλος χωλε* would have been wholly superfluous.

5. This

5. This interpolation from a *Lectionarium* is likewise rejected by Griesbach, as also *εἶπε ὁ Κύριος*, Luke vii. 31. and *οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον*, Acts xxi. 8.

6. Also in the two Vienna manuscripts described by Trefchow, and noted by Griesbach Codd. 124, 125. Namely the two verses of St. Luke's Gospel, ch. xxii. 43, 44. are copied in these manuscripts after the thirty-ninth verse of Matth. xxvi. But in the last of these three manuscripts the addition is only in the margin.

7. *Animadverteram multoties in media lectione quædam omiſſa eſſe, quæ legerentur in alia lectione.*

Evangelium secundum Lucam, ed. Matthäi, p. 446.

8. This is probably an erratum for Luke xxii. 43. To comprehend in what respects Wetſtein is here inaccurate, it is neceſſary to conſult Matthäi's note to this paſſage. Wetſtein however has not quoted falſely; he has only quoted too little. He mentions ten Evangeliftaria, in which the two verſes, Luke xxii. 43, 44. are omitted. This is a real fact, and cannot be denied even by Matthäi, though this learned editor relates, that in the ſame Evangeliftaria the ſame leſſon is found in another part, in which theſe verſes are not omitted. His words, which, as too often happens in the writings of this profound critic, were not dictated by a ſpirit of liberality and good breeding, are the following: 'Si ergo Wetſtenius primam lectionem intellexit, cum dixit hæc abeſſe, teſtimonium ejus veritati conſentaneum eſt: ſin de altera lectione monuit, mentitus eſt.'

9. An accurate deſcription of the Evangeliftaria is expected from Dr. Griesbach, in the ſecond volume of his *Symbolæ criticæ*. See the firſt volume, p. ccxxiv.

S E C T. III.

PAGE 165.

1. Our author is here totally ſilent in regard to the merits of the immortal Semler, who was the firſt critic that ventured to call in queſtion the opinion of Wetſtein,

stein, and to defend the Codices Græco-Latini against the charge, which Wetstein had laid to them. So early as the year 1765, two years therefore before the publication of our author's second edition of this Introduction, and twenty-three before the publication of the fourth, Dr. Semler printed the third volume of his Introduction to the Interpretation of Scripture, entitled *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, in which, both in the preface, and in several parts of the work itself, he supports these manuscripts against the accusation at that time admitted by our author, and perhaps by every critic in Europe. In his *Spicilegium Observationum*, annexed to *Wetstenii Libelli ad crisin N. T.* which he published in 1766, he delivers, p. 179, 191, &c. the same sentiments; more at large, p. 44—54. of his *Apparatus ad liberalem N. T. interpretationem*, published in 1767, and lastly in the beginning of the fourth volume of his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, printed in 1769. The original genius of this great critic and divine, permitted him in no case to be a blind follower of the opinion of others, he ascended constantly to the source itself, examined with his own eyes, and made more discoveries in sacred criticism, and ecclesiastical history, than the envy of his contemporaries has been willing to admit.

PAGE 166.

2. Namely the Codex Amandi, Claromontanus, Sangermanensis, and Boernerianus.

PAGE 170.

3. Erasmus could never imagine that the celebrated Codex Vaticanus was written after the council of Florence. The alterations therefore, a *secunda manu*, which are visible in this manuscript, must be those, which he meant to ascribe to one of the articles of convention in this council: and this is a very obvious construction of Erasmus's own words, '*Codices ad latinorum exemplaria emendatos.*' But he had never seen the manuscript, of which he speaks, for he says, in the passage quoted by
our

our author from the *Capita Argumentorum*, ‘*Talis adhuc dicitur* adservari in bibliotheca pontificia.’ In our author’s reference to Erasmus’s Note on Luke x. 1. is an erratum, which I have not been able to correct: Erasmus’s Note on that verse, in the edition of 1527, relates to a totally different subject.

PAGE 171.

4. It is true that the expression ‘*Romana lectio*,’ which Sepulveda here opposes to ‘*Græci codices*,’ is somewhat ambiguous, but he himself determines its meaning, by opposing in the same sentence ‘*exemplaria Romana*,’ to the ‘*exemplaria Græcorum*,’ and by giving in the following sentence to the ‘*exemplaria Romana*,’ the title of ‘*libri archetypi*.’ Where he opposes the Greek original to the Latin translation, he uses the terms ‘*dictio Græca*,’ and ‘*dictio Latina*.’

PAGE 172.

5. This conjecture is not probable. Dr. Semler, in a note to Simon Hist. critique du Texte du N. T. ch. xxix. supposes that Sepulveda understood by ‘*certus locus*,’ the celebrated passage 1 John v. 7. which the editors of the Complutum edition had translated from the Latin into Greek, his letter being dated Rome 1535, which was twenty-one years after that edition was printed, and thirteen after it was published.

6. This explanation leaves the matter in as much uncertainty as Sepulveda’s own expression, but the whole seems to be clear from Note 4. After all, it is a matter of no consequence, whether the agreement in question, to alter the Greek manuscripts from the Latin, took place at the council of Florence, or not. For in ancient manuscripts the original text may be distinguished from modern alterations, and new manuscripts written since the council of Florence are in other respects of little or no value.

PAGE 173.

7. The term 'recensio' was first applied to the manuscripts of the Greek Testament by Semler, in the third volume of his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, published in 1765, and his *Apparatus ad liberalem N. T. interpretationem*, published in 1767, and adopted by Griesbach, in his *Synopsis Evangeliorum*, and in his *Greek Testament and Symbolæ criticæ*.

PAGE 177.

8. Griesbach refers all these Recensiones to ages prior to the eighth century. *Mirum hoc videbitur nemini qui secum reputaverit sexto aut septimo sæculo extitisse jam illam recensionem quæ in codicibus recentioribus plerisque habetur, et a textu vulgari typis excuso parum differt; inde vero a sæculo octavo vix novam recensionem ullam procuratam fuisse, nec variantium lectionum numerum insigniter postea auctum esse, si sphalmata demas a librariis dormitantibus admissa, et glossas nonnullas e margine in textum temere translatas.*

Hist. textus ep. Paulin. sect. 1. § 11.

9. See Griesbach's *Symbolæ criticæ*, p. ix.

S E C T. IV.

PAGE 180.

1. For instance, Mill printed the text of Stephens's third edition, but Wettstein having adopted another text, was sometimes guilty of mistakes in accommodating to his own text, the various readings of that of Mill. To avoid this inconvenience, Professor Birch has abided by the text which Mill had adopted. See his Preface to the four Gospels, printed immediately before the Prolegomena.

PAGE 181.

2. Named by Knittel Codex Guelpherbytanus A, and quoted by Griesbach by the title Codex P.

3. Codex

3. Codex Guelpherbytanus B, and Griesbach's Codex Q.

4. To these publications may be added that of the Codex Boernerianus, printed at Meissen in Saxony, in 1791, under the following title, XIII epistolarum Pauli Codex Græcus, cum versione latina vetere vulgo Antehieronymiana, olim Boernerianus nunc bibliothecæ electoralis Dresdensis, summa fide et diligentia transcriptus et editus a C. F. Matthæi.

The Codex Vindobonensis, named Codex Lambecii primus, has been published by Professor Alter; for he has printed his Greek Testament from this manuscript, except where it had manifest errata, and even these he has carefully noted. This edition will be described in a following chapter.

5. In the Orient. Bibl. Vol. XXII. N°. 333. our author has printed a letter, which he had received from Professor Adler in the year 1783, in which he relates, that when Spoletti delivered his memorial to the Pope, in order to obtain permission to print the Codex Vaticanus, he was referred, according to the usual routine, to the inquisition, with the order that Father Mamachi, the magister sacri palatii, should be consulted in particular; whose ignorance, and its usual attendant, a spirit of intolerance, induced him to persuade the Pope to prevent the execution of the plan, under the pretence that the Codex Vaticanus differed from the Vulgate, and might therefore, if made known to the public, be prejudicial to the interests of the Christian religion. The Abbé Spoletti presented a second memorial to the Pope, in which he answered the objections of Father Mamachi, but the powers of the inquisition prevailed against arguments, which had no other support than sound reason. Professor Adler further relates, that since the death of Evodius Asseman, who was one of the librarians in the Vatican, the difficulty of access to the manuscripts is so great, as to make it almost impossible for a critic to derive at present any advantage from them; that it is strictly forbidden not only to copy, but even to collate them.

them. It is a fortunate circumstance, therefore, for the learned world, that Professor Birch had made such complete extracts from the Codex Vaticanus, before the intolerant principles of Cardinal Zelada, and Monsignor Reggio, had produced the present order. In the Orient. Bibl. Vol. XXIII. N° 348. our author has printed a letter, which he had received from the celebrated De Rossi, in which he endeavours to vindicate the honour of Pius VI. who is his friend and patron, and to shew that Spoletti abandoned the design of his own accord. But admitting that the Pope himself, as far as relates to his own private sentiments, was not averse to the undertaking, yet this at least is certain, that no public permission was ever given to Spoletti, though he repeatedly asked it; he was therefore obliged to abandon the design, since the private indulgence of the Pope, would have been no security against the vengeance of the inquisition. However, no obstacles were thrown in the way of the collation of MSS. in the Vatican for Dr. Holmes's edition of the Septuagint.

PAGE 184.

6. The rules, which are necessary to be observed in the critical use and application of the manuscripts of the Greek Testament, are given by Griesbach, in his *Historia textus epistolarum Paulinarum*, p. 18—23.

S E C T. V.

PAGE 184.

1. A list of manuscripts of the Greek Testament, hitherto uncollated, might be selected from the following publications, and perhaps from several others, with which I am unacquainted.

Bibliothecæ Apostolicæ Vaticanæ Codicum MStorum catalogus a Steph. Evodio Assëmano, et Jos. Simone Assëmano, Romæ 1756, 3 tom. fol. But only a few
 Vol. II. S f copies

copies of this catalogue remain, the rest having been destroyed in the fire which consumed a wing of the Vatican. The second volume contains the Greek manuscripts. A catalogue of the Vatican manuscripts is likewise given in Montfaucon *Bibl. bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 1—155.

Bibliothecæ Mediceo-Laurentianæ catalogus ab A. M. Biscionio digestus atque editus, Florentiæ, 1752—1756, 2 tom. fol.

Bandini *Catalogus Codicum Græcorum Bibliothecæ Medicæ Laurentianæ*, Florentiæ 1764—1770, 3 tom. folio.

Græca D. Marci Bibliotheca Codicum MStorum per titulos digesta, præside et moderatore Laurentio Theupolo, Equite, ac D. Marci Procuratore, jussu Senatus. Venetiis 1740, fol.

Græci Codices manuscripti apud Nanios Patricios Venetos asservati, Bononiæ 1784, 4to.

Codices manuscripti bibliothecæ regiæ Taurinensis, cum animadversionibus Passini, Rivautellæ, et Bertæ, cum figuris, Taurini 1749, fol.

Bibliotheca Ducis Mutinensis, printed in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 531. In this library are two manuscripts written in uncial letters, the one of the Gospels, the other of the Acts of the Apostles, which have never been collated.

Regiæ Bibliothecæ Madritensis Codices Græci MSti, a Johanne Iriarte, Madrid 1769, fol.

Catalogus librorum tam impressorum quam MStorum Bibliothecæ Lugduno-Batavæ, opera Wolferdi Senguerdii, Jac. Gronovii, et Joh. Heyman, Lugduni apud Batavos, 1716, fol. Supplementum, ib. 1741, fol.

Catalogus Codicum MStorum Bibliothecæ Regiæ, Parisiis 1739—1744, 4 tom. fol. of which the second volume contains the Greek manuscripts.

Bibliotheca Coisliniana, olim Seguieriana, studio et opera B. de Montfaucon, Parisiis 1715, fol.

P. Lambecii *Commentariorum de augustissima bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonenfi Libri octo*, Vindobonæ,

1665—1679, 8 tom. fol. It has been re-printed with considerable additions, by F. Kollar, ib. 1766—1782.

Nessellii Catalogus MStorum Orient. et Græcor. Bibliothecæ Vindobonensis, Vindobonæ 1690, 2 tom. fol.

Nessellii recensio specialis omnium codicum MStorum Bibliothecæ Vindobonensis, cura J. F. Reimanni, Hænoviæ 1712, 8vo.

Catalogus Codicum MStorum Bibliothecæ Gothanæ, Auctore E. S. Cypriano, Lipsiæ 1714, 4to.

C. T. de Murr Memorabilia Bibliothecarum publicarum Norimbergensium et Universitatis Altdorfinæ, Norimbergæ 1786—1788, 2 tom. 8vo.

Bibliotheca Codicum Græcorum serenissimi Baviaræ Ducis et Electoris, printed in the first volume of Montfaucon's Bibliotheca bibliothecarum, p. 587. In this library is an ancient manuscript, containing, beside the Acts and the Epistles, the book of Revelation.

Hensleri notitia codicum N. T. Græcorum, qui Havniæ in bibliotheca regia adservantur, Havniæ 1784, 8vo.

Erichsen's View of the collection of ancient manuscripts in the King of Denmark's great library, written in Danish, and published at Copenhagen in 1786, 8vo.

Matthæi Notitia Codicum MStorum Mosquensium, Mosquæ 1776, fol.

Thomæ Jamesii ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis distributa in libros duos, quorum prior continet catalogum confusum librorum MStorum in bibliothecis duarum academiarum Oxoniæ et Cantabrigiæ, posterior catalogum eorum distinctum et dispositum secundum quatuor facultates, observato tam in nominibus quam in operibus ipsis alphabetico literarum ordine. Londini 1600, 4to.

N. B. The Catalogue of the manuscripts of the Bodleian, published by Uri at Oxford, in 1787, includes only the Oriental.

Catalogi librorum MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti, Oxoniæ 1697, fol.

Catalogus librorum MStorum quos Collegio Corporis Christi in Academia Cantabrigiensi legavit M. Parkerus

Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis. Ed. J. Nasmith, Cantabrigiæ 1777, 4to.

Catalogus librorum MStorum bibliothecæ Cottonianæ, scriptore Thoma Smith, Oxonii 1696, fol.

Catalogue of the Harleian collection of manuscripts preserved in the British Museum, London 1759, 2 vols. folio.

Ayfcough's Catalogue of the manuscripts in the British Museum hitherto undescribed, Lond. 1782, 2 vols. 4to.

N. B. The five manuscripts of the Greek Testament, purchased at Dr. Askew's sale for the British Museum, are not in this catalogue, being purchased since the publication.

Casley's Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the King's Library, Lond. 1734, 4to.

Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova, ubi, quæ innumeris pene MStorum bibliothecis continentur, ad quodvis literaturæ genus spectantia et notatu digna, describuntur et indicantur a B. de Montfaucon, Parisiis 1739, 2 tom. fol.

Diarium Italicum, sive monumentorum veterum Bibliothecarum, Musæorum, &c. notitiæ singulares in itinerario Italico collectæ: additis schematibus ac figuris, a R. P. D. Bernardo de Montfaucon, Parisiis 1702, 4to.

Palæographia Græca, sive de ortu et progressu literarum Græcarum, et de variis omnium sæculorum scriptæ Græcæ generibus: itemque de abbreviationibus, et de notis variarum artium ac disciplinarum: additis figuris et schematibus ad fidem manuscriptorum codicum. Opera et studio D. Bernardi de Montfaucon, Parisiis 1708, fol.

Bibliotheca sacra, in binos syllabos distincta; quorum prior, qui jam tertio auctior prodit, omnes sive textus sacri, sive versionum ejusdem quavis lingua expressarum editiones, nec non præstantiores MSS. codices, cum notis historicis et criticis exhibet: posterior vero omnia eorum opera, qui huc usque in sacram scripturam quidpiam ediderunt. Labore et industria Jacobi Le Long, Parisiis 1723, 2 tom. fol.

The

The Florence library alone has at least a thousand Greek manuscripts, two of which are of the Revelation of St. John, as Adler relates in his *Biblisch-critische Reise*, p. 60. The royal library in Paris, as appears from the Catalogue above-quoted, Vol. II. p. 12—20. has eighty manuscripts either of the whole, or of parts of the Greek Testament, sixty-five Catenæ or commentaries, enumerated p. 28—40. which likewise have the text of parts at least of the Greek Testament; and fifty-seven *Lectionaria*, enumerated among the *Libri Rituales*, p. 40—57. making in all two hundred and two, of which only forty-nine have been collated. It appears likewise from the *Diarium Italicum*, the *Palæographia Græca*, and the *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, that there are many manuscripts of the Greek Testament in uncial letters, in the different libraries of Italy, which have never been collated. Nor is it improbable that many lie buried in the libraries of Constantinople, as appears from the accounts given by the Abbé Toderini, in his *Letteratura Turchesca*, published at Venice in 1787, in 3 vols. 8vo. Lastly, Blanchini, in the *Appendixes* to his *Evangeliarum Quadruplex*, has described many manuscripts, which have been hitherto unnoticed in the editions of the Greek Testament.

S E C T. VI.

PAGE 185.

1. Within the last few years, the number of collated manuscripts of the Greek Testament has been very considerably augmented, by the industry of Professors Matthæi, Alter, and Birch: occasional reference therefore will be made, in the course of these notes, to such as either have not, or could not have been described by our author.

PAGE 186.

2. This sentence I have considerably softened in the translation, because the original is couched in terms,

s s 3

which

which no man of learning ought to use towards another. The suspicion, which our author would excite in regard to the accuracy of Dr. Semler's quotations, is not only uncandid, but ungrounded, and he has thereby withheld from his readers much valuable information, which he might have derived from the excellent work to which he alludes; but as the translator, taught by experience, places as much confidence in the quotations of Semler as in those of Michaelis, he will take the liberty to introduce occasional remarks from a treatise, of which it is sufficient to say, that it is quoted by Griesbach and Woide. Its German title is, *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, printed at Halle in 1760—1769, 4 vols. 12mo. the two last volumes of which contain the best critical description of all the known manuscripts of all the Greek Testament, which has hitherto been given.

N. B. In the following catalogue of manuscripts, our author does not particularly distinguish those which are written in capital, or, as they are commonly called, uncial letters, from those which are written in small characters. But they are distinguished by Wetstein's notation of them, which our author always mentions, and in which the former are denoted by letters, the latter by cyphers.

CODEX ALEXANDRINUS.

PAGE 187.

3. To place this dispute in a clear point of view, and determine which of the two eminent critics, Wetstein or Woide, was mistaken, it is necessary to examine the original documents, on which the whole of the controversy depends. These documents are three in number,

a) The Arabic subscription, written by a proprietor of this manuscript before it came into the hands of Cyrillus Lucaris, and of which the following is a translation, *Memorant hunc librum scriptum esse calamo Theclæ martyris,*

b) The

b) The subscription written by Cyrillus himself, viz. *Liber iste scripturæ sacre Novi et Veteris Testamenti, prout ex traditione habemus, est scriptus manu Theclæ nobilis sceminae Ægyptiæ, ante mille et trecentos annos circiter, paulo post concilium Nicænum. Nomen Theclæ in fine libri erat exaratum, sed extincto Christianismo in Ægypto a Mohammedanis, et libri una Christianorum in similem sunt redacti conditionem. Extinctum ergo et Theclæ nomen et laceratum, sed memoria et traditio recens observat.*

Cyrillus, Patriarcha Constantin.

c) The testimony of Matthæus Muttis, a contemporary, friend, and deacon of Cyrillus, and who afterwards instructed in the Greek language John Rudolph Wetstein, uncle of the celebrated editor of the Greek Testament. His testimony is conveyed in a letter written to Martin Bogdan, a physician in Bern, and dated Jan. 14, 1664. ‘*Præceptorem in Græcis hic habui Matthæum Muttis ex Cypro, ejusdem Patriarchæ diaconum, qui retulit codicem illum inventum in monte Atho, in cujus ambitu sunt monasteria xxii. totidem castella monachorum, nunquam a Turcis expugnata, sed tributo penso hæctenus conservata. Vid. Wetstenii Prolegom. p. 10.*

Now this last document alone can decide on the question relative to the place, where this manuscript was discovered; for Cyrillus himself is totally silent on that subject, and the Arabic subscription can have no reference to it. But Woide, in his twelfth paragraph, endeavours to weaken the evidence of Matthæus Muttis, and to render the testimony of the elder Wetstein suspicious, though every impartial reader must be convinced, after perusing these three documents, that the last is the only one which is entitled to any credit; for it is the direct and positive testimony of men of character, whose honesty we have no reason to doubt, whereas the two first documents are nothing more than fabulous tradition. That Woide’s objections are really ungrounded, is clearly pointed out by Spohn, in his edition of the *Notitia*

codicis Alexandrini, p. 10—13.; but admitting them to be real, what inference shall we deduce? That the Codex Alexandrinus was found by Cyrillus in Alexandria? By no means. It is well known that Cyrillus, before he went to Alexandria, spent some time on mount Athos, the Greek repository and manufactory of manuscripts of the New Testament, whence a great number has been brought into the West of Europe, and a still greater number has been sent to Moscow: it is therefore at least possible, if not probable, independently of the evidence of Muttis, that Cyrillus procured it there either by purchase or by present, took it with him to Alexandria, and brought it thence on his return to Constantinople. This possibility alone is sufficient to destroy the inference, that Cyrillus discovered it in Alexandria, drawn from the supposed invalidity of the testimony of Muttis. In short, if we reject this testimony, for which however there is no ground, we are left wholly in the dark; and the inquiry relative to the place, where this manuscript was discovered by Cyrillus, must be abandoned to conjecture. It must at the same time be acknowledged, that the Arabic subscription in the Codex Alexandrinus clearly proves, that it had been in Egypt, at some period or other, before it fell into the hands of Cyrillus.

4. See Spohn's objections, p. 32. of his edition of the *Notitia codicis Alexandrini*. Compare also Woide, § 33. with Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 113. Montfaucon says, *In omnibus variarum regionum, provinciarum, et locorum, codicibus eandem characteris formam advertimus, exceptis Ægyptiacis ad Coptorum ritum scriptis, qui insolenti modo exarati sunt.* Now as this difference is not observable in the Codex Alexandrinus, we might conclude that it was not written in Egypt. But Montfaucon, who takes for granted that it really was, solves the difficulty by supposing, that the manuscript was written before that peculiar mode of writing was in use in Egypt, of which he gives a specimen, p. 259.

5. This

5. This Codex received the name of Alexandrinus, because Cyrillus brought it immediately, though perhaps not originally, from Alexandria: but if we argue from the name, to the place where it was written, we shall conclude that every Codex Bodleianus, and Codex Vaticanus, was written in the Bodleian and the Vatican. We may conclude however on other grounds, that it was really written in Egypt. 1. The Arabic subscription shews that it once belonged to an Egyptian, or that during some time it was preserved in Egypt, where Arabic has been spoken since the seventh century. 2. We know that a great number of manuscripts of the Greek Bible have been written in Egypt. 3. Woide, in his 33^d. section, has shewn a remarkable coincidence in certain points of orthography between the Cod. Alex. and the writings of the Copts. From all which circumstances it is reasonable to suppose, that the Codex Alexandrinus was written in Egypt. See also the arguments produced by Wurflein in his Prolegomena, p. 10. But that which he derives from the similarity between the readings of the Codex Alexandrinus, and those of the Coptic version, the margin of the Philoxenian version, &c. is no absolute proof, because this similarity might still be found, even if the Codex Alexandrinus had been copied at Constantinople from a manuscript written in Egypt.

PAGE 188.

6. Our author here relates as a matter of fact, that a Greek subscription of this import actually existed in the Codex Alexandrinus, though at present no traces of it are visible. But for this assertion we have no other authority, than a tradition recorded by Cyrillus in the Latin subscription which he wrote to this manuscript. See Note 3. *b*. It is however not impossible that a Greek subscription originally existed in this manuscript, as it was the usual practice of transcribers to subjoin to each copy, which they had taken, their name, the date, and the place where it was written: but it is surely more reasonable to ascribe its loss to accident, than, as Cy-

rillus

rillus did, to design. If any man, on purchasing a book without a title-page, should ascribe its loss to the malice or envy of some enemy to the contents of the book itself, he would be justly exposed to ridicule; but when a subject is covered by the veil of antiquity, mysterious conjectures are too easily admitted, and the honest but weak Cyrillus, whose brethren groaned under the yoke of Mohammed, was as ready to ascribe every trivial misfortune to the barbarity of the Saracens, as the Spaniards of the middle ages to the cruelty of the Moors.

7. Woide replies, § 43: that a distinction must be made between Thecla martyr, and Thecla protomartyr.

8. Our author is here not perfectly accurate. Woide says, § 28. *Alia atramenti specie scriptum est initium et finis codicis, alia medium ejus. Priori atramento reliquæ Matthæi, Marcus et index Periocharum Lucæ, et deinde secunda epistola ad Corinthios, a medio versus octavi capitis decimi, nec non reliquæ epistolæ Pauli, epistola ad Hebræos et revelatio Johannis exaratae sunt: posteriori Lucas, Johannes, Acta Apostolorum, epistolæ catholicæ omnes, epistola ad Romanos, prima ad Corinthios, et secunda ad medium versus octavi capitis decimi.* The place therefore, where the one ceases, and the other commences, is not in the middle.

To the extracts given by our author from Woide, § 28. may be added, *In initio et fine libri membrana plerumque est tenuior, quam perrodit atramentum acrius fuscum, spissum, et deciduum: in medio libri atramentum est tenue et flavum, et charta pergamena est compactior et præstantior. Ejusdem tamen ævi est utrumque atramentum quia folium reperitur, cujus altera pagina fuscido, altera flavo atramento scripta esse videtur.* But he has taken no notice of a question, which justly merits the attention of a critic, whether the goodness of the text itself is affected by the difference of the handwriting, whether this difference is accompanied by a diversity in the orthography, in the accuracy of the transcript, and above all, whether it betrays a diversity of manuscripts, from which the Cod. Alex. was copied.

9. Yet

9. Yet the Codex Alex. abbreviates, ανθρωπος, δαδιδ, θεος, ιησος, ισραηλ, κυριος, μητηρ, πατηρ, πρηνος, πνευμα, σαυρος, σωτηρ, υιος, χριστος. It has also other marks of abbreviation. See Woide's Preface, § 34. But Dr. Semler, in his Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, Vol. III. p. 62. supposes that the more ancient manuscript, from which the Cod. Alex. was copied, had a much greater number; from a false method of decyphering which marks, he explains many errors committed by the copyist of the latter. See his Note 33. to Wetstein's Prolegomena.

10. In the third section of his preface. At the end of this section he takes notice of the corrections which have been made in this manuscript, and observes that Wetstein has not been sufficiently accurate in his manner of noting them. This subject he has examined more at large in a German essay, printed in the third volume of the Kielische Beyträge.

PAGE 189.

11. After a great display of learning, in which Woide examines the evidence for the antiquity of the Cod. Alex. he concludes, at the end of sect. 4. Codicem Alexandrinum intra medium et finem sæculi quarti scriptum esse. This is the very greatest antiquity, that can possibly be allowed to the Codex Alexandrinus, for it has not only the *τιτλοι* or *κεφαλαια* *majora*, but the *κεφαλαια* *minora*, or Ammonian sections, accompanied with the references to the canons of Eusebius: but our author does not believe it to be so ancient by at least two centuries. Those who would examine the objections, that may be made to Woide's arguments in particular, may consult Spohn's remarks on Woide's fourth section, p. 42—109. of his edition of the *Notitia codicis Alexandrini*. Montfaucon, in his *Palæographia Græca*, Lib. III. cap. iii. ascribes to the Codex Alexandrinus about the same age, as to the two manuscripts of Dioscorides, the one preserved at Vienna, the other at Naples. Lambecius, in his description of the Codex Dioscoridis preserved at Vienna,

na, in his *Commentarii de augustissima bibl. Cæs. Vin-*
dobonensi, Lib. II. cap. vi. has made it appear that
 this manuscript was written by order of the Empress
 Juliana Anicia, at the beginning of the sixth century.
 Now as this manuscript of Dioscorides is the only Greek
 manuscript written in uncial letters, of which the date
 can be determined with any precision, (Montfaucon
Palæog. Græc. Lib. III. c. ii. p. 195.) and the charac-
 ters of this manuscript, when compared with the oldest
 inscriptions, appear to be as ancient, as those of any
 manuscript now extant, Montfaucon, p. 185. is of opi-
 nion that neither the *Codex Alexandrinus*, nor any other
 Greek manuscript, can be said with much probability
 to be prior, any length of time, to the sixth century.
 He allows the possibility, but says that he had never
 been able to discover any certain marks in a Greek MS.
 which could warrant him to assert, that it actually was
 older than the sixth century. The age of manuscripts
 written since the ninth century may be ascertained, be-
 cause they have very frequently a subscription expressive
 of the year in which they were written. See Montfaucon
Palæographia Græca, p. 42—91. But as no date is
 found in manuscripts prior to that period, we must
 judge from the form of the letters, and a comparison of
 them with inscriptions, of which we know the date. In
 this manner Montfaucon, in his *Palæographia Græca*,
 Lib. III. ascertains the date of Greek manuscripts writ-
 ten between the fifth and the ninth century. It must be
 observed however, that the form of the letters is not
 the only criterion for determining the age of those an-
 cient manuscripts, as appears from our author's account
 of the *Cod. Alexandrinus*, and *Cod. Vaticanus*.

It may be here observed, that the question relative to
 the antiquity of a manuscript, is of much less importance,
 than that which relates to the antiquity of its text. The
 distinction between these two questions, to which the
 early critics have paid too little attention, has been best
 displayed by Dr. Semler. If a manuscript, for instance,
 written in the tenth century, has readings, which coin-
 cide

cide with the quotations of Origen, in such a manner as to justify the opinion, that it was copied from a manuscript of the Alexandrine edition, and of the third century, it will follow that the vellum and the ink are only 800 years old, the text 1500. Besides, the latter question is not only more important, but may be ascertained with greater certainty, because we have a standard, or criterion, by which we may judge, whereas we are seldom in possession of sufficient data, to determine with accuracy the former question.

12. Here our author is mistaken, for Woide, in the fifth paragraph of his preface, quotes a very long passage from the third edition of Michaelis's Introduction, which in the German original is Vol. I. p. 466.

13. Compare Woide's fifth section de præstantia codicis, with Spohn's very solid objections, p. 183—257. of his edition of the Notitia codicis Alexandrini.

PAGE 190.

14. On this subject Woide has eminently displayed his critical abilities, and in his sixth section, de latinizatione codicis, has most ably defended the ancient Greek manuscripts in general, and the Codex Alexandrinus in particular, from the charge of having been corrupted from the Latin. See also what Griesbach has said on this subject in his Symbolæ, p. cxi.

15. This is one of the manuscripts collated by Matthæi, who has noted it by the letter l, in his edition of the Greek Testament. See his note to Acts iv. 25.

16. Also in the Ethiopic version. See Griesbach in loco.

PAGE 191.

17. See Wettstein in loco, for Griesbach has not quoted the Coptic version for this reading, either in his Greek Testament, or in his Symbolæ.

18. And of the Ethiopic. See Griesbach in loco.

19. The Ethiopic version has likewise a reading expressive of ἀπεχολογας.

20. The

20. The readings of the Codex Alexandrinus coincide very frequently, not only with the Coptic, and the old Syriac, but with the new Syriac and the Ethiopic, as may be seen on examining Wettstein and Griesbach, in examples where this manuscript is quoted, a circumstance which favours the hypothesis, that the Codex Alexandrinus was written in Egypt, because the new Syriac version having been collated with Egyptian manuscripts of the Greek Testament, and the Ethiopic version being immediately taken from them, have necessarily the readings of the Alexandrine edition.

21. See Griesbach's *Symbolæ criticae*, p. ix.

PAGE 192.

22. It is thus written in the Cod. Alex. and not *αποδοσεως*, as appears from Woide's edition. Though no other Greek manuscript has this reading, it is expressed in the Ethiopic version, which again corroborates the observation made Note 20.

PAGE 194.

23. The German title of this work is, Rathleffs *Geschichte jetzt lebender Gelehrten*. It was published at Zelle in 1740—1747, in 12 vols. 8vo.

PAGE 195.

24. See Wettstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 12. and Semler's Note 30, to his edition of the *Prolegomena*, p. 37.

25. Dr. Semler has likewise treated of this manuscript in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 61—82.

PAGE 196.

26. But it does not appear that Cyrillus ever denied that he found it on mount Athos, and our author is totally mistaken in saying that Cyrillus described it as having been found in Egypt. He describes it as having been written in Egypt; but of the place, where he first discovered it, he says not a single syllable. See Note 3,
where

where the subscription of Cyrillus is given at full length. But our author is not the only critic, who has quoted the Patriarch of Constantinople, for an evidence which he has never given, or at least has never committed to writing. That Cyrillus presented this manuscript to Sir Thomas Roe on his return from Alexandria, without mentioning that he first discovered it on mount Athos, is no argument against the reality of the fact: for every donor, being inclined to enhance the value of his present, will of course conceal those circumstances, which may tend to diminish its value: whereas Muttis, who had no such interest to promote, candidly confessed what Cyrillus had not indeed denied, but only passed over in silence.

27. The possibility that Greek manuscripts in Alexandria were altered from the Latin no one can deny. Even so early as the time of Origen single alterations might have taken place, for the learned father in a passage quoted by Wetstein in his note to Matth. viii. 28. complains of erroneous readings *εν τοις Ελληνικοις αλτιγραφοις*, which clearly implies the use of manuscripts written in some other language than the Greek: and as he spent some time in Rome, it is not impossible that he made use of the established version of a church, which at all times maintained the highest authority.

PAGE 198.

28. See Woide's Preface, § 38. He adds, *alia quædam præterea defunt, quæ a solo Waltonio interdum annotata fuisse video.*

PAGE 199.

29. The following account is nothing more than a translation of our author's German translation of the Latin subscription written by Cyrillus. See therefore the original, quoted Note 3. With respect to the examples produced by our author, in the preceding paragraph from Grabe's Prolegomena, to prove the ignorance of the writer of the Codex Alexandrinus, see Woide's answer, § 32. of his Preface.

30. See Note 7.

31. The Arabic subscription by no means confutes itself, unless a sense be ascribed to it which the writer probably intended not to express. He says nothing more than, 'that this manuscript is said to have been written by one Thecla a martyress.' Now, as various persons of this name might have suffered martyrdom, it is surely unreasonable to suppose, that the writer of the Arabic subscription intended to express the contemporary of St. Paul in particular. Our author's opinion that Cyrillus appealed not to the Arabic subscription, but to a tradition unconnected with that which is there recorded, seems to be without foundation, and the true state of the case appears to be the following. Some centuries after the Codex Alexandrinus had been written, and the Greek subscription and perhaps those other parts where it is now defective already lost, it fell into the hands of a Christian inhabitant of Egypt, who not finding the usual Greek subscription of the copyist, added in his native language (Arabic having been spoken in Egypt since the close of the seventh century) the tradition, either true or false, which had been preserved in the family or families, to which the manuscript had belonged: 'memorant hunc codicem scriptum esse calamo Theclæ martyris.' In the seventeenth century, when oral tradition respecting this manuscript had probably ceased, it becomes the property of Cyrillus Lucaris, whether in Alexandria, or on mount Athos, is of no importance to the present inquiry. On examining the manuscript, he finds that the Greek subscription is lost, but that there is a tradition recorded in Arabic by a former proprietor, in which is simply related that it was written by one Thecla a martyress, which is undoubtedly what he means by 'memoria et traditio recens.' Taking therefore upon trust that one Thecla a martyress was really the copyist, he consults the annals of the church to discover in what age and country a person of this name and character
existed,

existed, finds that an Egyptian lady of rank, who was called Thecla, suffered martyrdom, between the time of holding the council of Nicæa and the close of the fourth century, and concludes, without further ceremony, that she was the very identical copyist. Not satisfied with this discovery, he attempts to account for the loss of the Greek subscription, and ascribes it to the malice of the Saracens, being weak enough to believe that the enemies of Christianity would exert their vengeance on the name of a poor transcriber, and leave the four folio volumes themselves unhurt. I acknowledge that what has been here advanced is mere hypothesis, but as we are wholly destitute of historical evidence, it is our only refuge, and it is most reasonable to adopt that, which solves the difficulties in the easiest and simplest manner.

PAGE 201.

32. The Accœmets were μοναχοι κοιμητοι. With respect to the opinion that the Cod. Alex. was written by a monk of this order, see Semler's Note 25 to Wetstein's Prolegomena. If it was written by a monk of this order, Wetstein says (Prol. p. 10) that it is an argument in favour of its being written rather at Constantinople, than at Alexandria.

33. Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux, et militaires, par le P. Helyot. Paris 1720. 8 tom. 4to.

PAGE 202.

34. See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 11. or p. 34. of Semler's edition with his Note 27.

PAGE 203.

35. Dr. Semler, in his notes to Wetstein's Prolegomena, is totally silent as to the argument which Wetstein derives from αγοραι. In his Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, Vol. III. p. 62. he refers the Cod. Alex. to the seventh century. Wetstein makes it not only more ancient than the seventh century, but supposes (Proleg. p. 11.) that it was one of the manuscripts collated at

VOL. II.

T t

Alexandria

Alexandria in 615 for the New Syriac version; an opinion which has been refuted by Dr. Ridley in his treatise *De versionibus Syriacis*, sect. 15. Adler likewise, on collating the marginal readings of the Philoxenian version in the four Gospels, found only two, which were peculiar to the Codex Alexandrinus. See his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 131.

PAGE 208.

36. The example which now follows, in the account taken from the third edition, is applied in a totally different manner in the new description which our author has given in his fourth edition: he would have avoided therefore not only repetitions but contradictions, if instead of printing the two descriptions separately, he had combined his remarks in one single uniform relation. But this liberty would have been unwarranted in a translation. See Note 14.

37. An inference of this kind would be very uncertain, for though we may conclude from the antiquity of the three volumes containing the Old Testament, to that of the fourth, which contains the New, yet the former may have a very correct text of the Septuagint, the latter a very incorrect text of the Greek Testament. Nay, we cannot even conclude from the text of one page to that of another, in the New Testament alone, since the several parts contain the text of several editions. See Griesbach's *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. ix.

PAGE 209.

38. To prevent mistakes it is necessary to observe, that the word 'part' is here not equivalent to 'volume,' as Wetstein's Greek Testament consists only of two volumes, but of four parts; the first containing the Gospels, the second the epistles of St. Paul, the third the Acts and the catholic epistles, and the fourth the book of Revelation.

39. Here may be inserted the following MSS. collated by Birch.

CODICES

CODICES ANGELICI

IN BIBLIOTHECA AUGUSTIN. EREMIT. ROMÆ.

Codex Angelicus 1, in folio, membranaceus, foliorum 272, quatuor evangelia complectitur, quibus canones Eusebii præmittuntur. Scriptus est sæculo xi. judice Montfaucon.

Codex Angelicus 2, in quarto, membranaceus, foliorum 219, sæculi xi. vel xii. quatuor evangelia continet, quibus tabulæ Harmoniæ Eusebianæ, et κεφαλαίων indices præmissæ sunt.

Birch Prolegomena, p. 48.

CODEX ASKEWANUS.

PAGE 210.

40. This MS. was purchased at Dr. Askew's sale, with several other MSS. of the Greek Testament, by the Trustees of the British Museum, where it is at present preserved, and marked 5115 among the additional manuscripts. Our Author speaks of three volumes, the first containing the Gospels, the two last the Acts and the Epistles, which, as Askew supposed, are parts of the same whole. The three volumes were sold at Dr. Askew's sale, as three distinct manuscripts, but all three were purchased for the British Museum, the trustees of which have not considered them as parts of one whole, for the volume which contains the Gospels is now marked in the British Museum among the additional manuscripts, N°. 5116, that which contains the Epistles of St. Paul 5117, but that which contains the Acts and the catholic epistles 5115. They are not of the octavo size, as our author says, but small quarto. It may not be improper to mention at present in what manner the other manuscripts of the Greek Testament, which belonged to Dr. Askew, were disposed of at the sale of his books. Beside the three already mentioned, which were noted in the catalogue of sale 609. 620. 630. two others were purchased

chased for the British Museum, noted in the catalogue of sale 621, 622, both of them manuscripts of the Gospels, the one in two volumes 4to. which was sold for twenty nine pounds eight shillings, the other in one volume large 4to. which was sold for twenty seven pounds six shillings. The latter was brought from Mount Athos, and was written in the year 1159, by one Nephon, a monk. These two MSS. are noted at present in the

British Museum $\left. \begin{matrix} 5^{111} \\ 5^{112} \end{matrix} \right\}$ and 5107. Another of Dr.

Askew's manuscripts, noted in the catalogue of sale 624. containing the four Gospels, in one volume folio, was purchased for the University Library in Cambridge, and cost twenty pounds. The two remaining MSS. of the Greek Testament, which were sold at Dr. Askew's sale, were purchased by Mr. Lowes, but these have been re-fold, and I know not where they are at present. They were both manuscripts of the Gospels. All Dr. Askew's manuscripts of the Greek Testament, are written on vellum, but none in uncial letters.

41. Dr. Velthusen, in answer to these objections of Professor Kulencamp, published in 1777 a defence of the antiquity of the Askew manuscript, which is printed in the first volume of the *Kielische Beyträge*.

In addition to those above-mentioned Dr. Askew possessed an *Evangelistarium*, which formerly belonged to Dr. Mead, and was quoted by Wetstein by the title *Codex Meadi*. It was purchased by Mademoiselle D'Eon. See Note 211.

CODEx AUGIENSIS.

42. This is the utmost that can be allowed to the antiquity of the *Codex Augiensis*, for its Latin conclusion, quoted by Wetstein, Vol. II. p. 9. is taken from the works of Rhabanus Maurus, as Dr. Semler has remarked in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. IV. p. 66; and that this passage from Rhabanus Maurus was written by the same person, who wrote the manuscript itself, I have found on examining the hand writing. The
Greek

Greek text is written in capitals, and the Latin in Anglo-saxon letters: it must therefore have been written in the West of Europe, where that formation of the Latin letters, which is vulgarly called Anglo-saxon, was in general use between the seventh and twelfth centuries. A critical examination of the readings of this MS. is given by Dr. Semler, Vol. IV. p. 67—80. of the above-mentioned work.

43. The Codex Augiensis is at present in the library of Trinity College in Cambridge, where it was deposited in 1787, after the death of the younger Bentley, together with the other manuscripts of the celebrated Dr. Richard Bentley. Under the names Georgii Michaelis Wepferi, and Ludovici Christiani Mieggii, which are mentioned by Wetstein, Vol. II. p. 8. Bentley has written *Emptus est hic Codex Richardo Bentleio, A. D. MDCCXVIII*, which corresponds with Bentley's letter, printed in Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 153. Beside the Latin conclusion quoted by Wetstein, Vol. II. p. 8. there is written on the front part of the last leaf which is pasted to the binding, *Monasterium Augiæ in Belgis, ubi institutus est Goddeschalcus*. It is written in uncial letters, and without accents: but the letters are not written continua serie, for there are not only intervals between the words, but at the end of every word there is a dot. The words *Χριστος* and *Ιησους* are not abbreviated, as in the common manuscripts, *XC* and *IC*, but *XPC* and *IHC*, as in the Codex Cantabrigiensis.

44. Yet not only the Augiensis and Claromontanus, but likewise the Boernerianus has *εγκακεμεν*, 2 Cor. iv. 1. but written contrary to the usual Greek orthography *εγκακεμεν*. See Matthæi's edition of the Codex Boernerianus, fol. 43.

CODICES AUGUSTANI.

PAGE 211.

The Augsburg MSS. are described in Montfaucon *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 592. and in the

Bibliothecæ Augustanæ Vindelicæ Græcorum Codicum Catalogus. Augustæ Vindelicorum, 1605. The last mentioned catalogue I have never seen, but I quote it on the authority of the Leyden Catalogue, p. 184. Montfaucon ascribes to a printed catalogue of Augsberg MSS. the date 1595.

CODEX BANDURI.

PAGE 212.

This fragment is printed in Montfaucon's *Palæographia Græca*, p. 235. in uncial letters resembling the original.

CODICES BARBERINI.

PAGE 213.

45. This is a very extraordinary assertion; the readings of Marcion are quoted by every critic, and our author himself approves it, whereas no motive could justify a critic in quoting from a collection of readings, where the collection itself is a forgery. The cases are by no means parallel.

46. Our author has here printed an account of the celebrated Codex Vaticanus, which had been communicated to him by Professor Birch, from which it appears that this was one of the manuscripts collated by Caryl.

PAGE 214.

47. Prolegomena, p. 61. It may seem extraordinary, that Wetstein, as well as our author in the place to which this note refers, should say that Stephens has quoted, in the margin of his edition, ten manuscripts of the Gospels, eight of the Acts and the Epistles, and two of the Revelation, when it is certain that Stephens had only sixteen, including the Complutensian edition. But it must be observed that, according to this calculation, the same individual manuscript may be reckoned twice the

or thrice. For instance, the Codex α , or the Complutum edition, which includes the whole N. T., is reckoned thrice, first in the Gospels, secondly in the Acts and the Epistles, thirdly in the Revelation. The Codex β , which includes the Gospels and the Acts, is in the same manner reckoned twice, and so of the rest; in consequence of which division the number in question is made out.

PAGE 215.

48. This appears from a comparison of Mill's extracts with those of Blanchini. Their coincidence shews that both drew from the same source, the *Collatio Caryophili*.

PAGE 216.

49. See Birch's *Prolegomena* to his Greek Testament, p. 36—45. But beside the six Vatican MSS. in which Birch discovered the readings of the *Collatio Caryophili*, he has described, p. 33—36. ten manuscripts of the Gospels, which are preserved in the Barberini library. Two of these he quotes, John vii. 53. for the omission of the story of the adulterers; Mill likewise quotes, for the same omission, two Codd. Barb. from the *Collatio Caryophili*. Now as Caryophilus used precisely ten manuscripts of the Gospels, a doubt may arise on this subject, which perhaps the learned editor is able to remove. The ten Codices Barberiniani of the Gospels are the following:

1. Cod. Barberinianus 8.
2. Cod. Barberinianus 9.
3. Cod. Barberinianus 10.
4. Cod. Barberinianus 11.
5. Cod. Barberinianus 12.
6. Cod. Barberinianus 13.
7. Cod. Barberinianus 14.
8. Cod. Barberinianus 118.
9. Cod. Barberinianus 208.
10. Cod. Barberinianus 211.

A catalogue, though an imperfect one, of the manuscripts in the Barberini library is given in Montfaucon *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 171.

CODICES BAROCCIANI.

50. The Codd. Barocciani are preserved in the Bodleian. Our author describes only two by this name, because Wettstein included the others under the Codd. Bodleiani. The Codices Barocciani in general are described in the *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti*. Oxoniæ 1697, fol. p. 1—38. They were brought from Venice, and given to the Bodleian library in 1629, by Lord Pembroke. The origin of their name is mentioned at the end of the preface to the above quoted work : *Qui, quoniam ex bibliotheca clarissimi Barocci prodierunt, ab eo libri Barocciani appellantur.*

CODD. BASILEENSES.

PAGE 217.

A catalogue, though a very imperfect one, of the manuscripts belonging to the city of Basel, may be seen in Montfaucon *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 607—615. taken from Spizellii *Arcana bibliothecarum*.

PAGE 218.

51. A critical examination of the readings of this MS. is given in the *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 137—145.

52. It is true that Wettstein's Codex 1, in the book of Revelation is likewise called Codex Reuchlini, as well as his Codex 1, in the three first parts of his Greek Testament, but they are two totally distinct manuscripts. The former contains the book of Revelation alone, whereas the latter has all the books of the Greek Testament, except the Revelation. Though it is possible therefore that

that they were originally parts of the same whole, yet in regard to their exterior they must be considered as separate manuscripts, and they are even described as such by our author, the latter being still preserved at Basel, whereas Wetstein was unable to discover the former. See his Greek Testament, Vol. I. p. 42, and Vol. II. p. 742. It may be observed, that the MS. of the Revelation called Cod. Reuchlini, was that from which Erasmus printed his text of that book : but this MS. belongs not to the present inquiry. It will be particularly described by our author, No. 221.

PAGE 219.

53. Dr. Semler is of the same opinion. In his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 173—179. and Vol. IV. p. 131—134. he has given a critical examination of its readings.

54. That Origen made alterations from the Latin is not absolutely impossible. See Note 27.

55. Also of the Ethiopic.

56. Also the Vercellenfis, Colbertinus, and the Latin Cantabrigiensis. See Griesbach in loco.

PAGE 220.

57. Mark vi. 15.

58. But in the old Syriac the particle *ol* is omitted.

59. But Origen quotes the passage without this disjunctive particle, nor is it found either in the Coptic, or Ethiopic versions, which were certainly taken from manuscripts of the Alexandrine edition.

60. Wetstein adds, *Multa etiam ob ομοιοτελευτα omittit.*

61. Wetstein has quoted them in his *Prolegomena*, p. 44. under the title, *Exempla ex margine hujus codicis petita, ubi eum Erasmus suâ manu perperam correxit.*

PAGE 221.

62. See Matthäi's Note to this passage.

PAGE 222.

63. It proves therefore that the readings in the *Collatio Caryophili*, were not forged either by Caryophilus, or Poffin, but it leaves the question undetermined, with respect to the particular manuscripts, from which Caryophilus selected them. See Note 49.

64. See Birch's *Prolegomena*, p. 40—45.

65. Our author here quotes an opinion of Dr. Semler, without referring to the place where it is given. I have carefully examined what Semler has written on this subject in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. IV. p. 141—148. but he there gives an opinion which is diametrically opposite to that asserted by our author, for he conjectures not that this manuscript was copied from the *Complutum* edition, but that it was one of the manuscripts which were collated for that publication, an inference which he deduces from the coincidence, which he had discovered between their readings. He refers it a century prior to the publication of the *Complutum* edition, and p. 142. gives it as his opinion, that it was copied from a very ancient manuscript.

CODICES SANCTI BASILII.

PAGE 223.

A catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of St. Basilus in Rome is given by Montfaucon in his *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 194—198.

66. The description which Blanchini gives of this MS. in his *Evangeliarium quadruplex*, P. I. p. 519, is the following: *Præclarissimus vetustusque Codex cxix*, in quarto, eadem pari diligentia ac antedictus *clii*, summoque pariter labore ab anonymo Palæographo in charta pergamena, microcallistis characteribus, conscriptus continet *Novum Testamentum*.

67. Since the publication of our author's *Introduction*, this manuscript has been collated by Professor Birch, and its readings inserted in his edition of the Greek Testament.

tament. He has described it in his *Prolegomena*, p. 46, 47.

68. Several manuscripts of the Greek Testament preserved in the valuable library of the monastery of St. Basilus in Rome are described by Philippus Vitalis in the *Evangeliarium quadruplex*, P. I. p. 506—529, with plates containing specimens of their letters. Of these the following have been collated by Professor Birch.

1. Codex S^ti Basilii xxii, membranaceus, in quarto, foliorum 155, sæculi xi, quatuor evangelia continet, cum tabulis harmoniæ Eusebianæ.

2. Codex xli, in quarto, membranaceus, anno a mundi creatione 6561, a C. N. 1053 conscriptus, foliorum 132, ab initio et fine mutilus, quatuor evangelia complectitur.

3. Codex cxix, in quarto, membranaceus, foliorum 247, sæculi ut videtur xi, integrum N. T. complectitur. This is the same which our author describes N^o. 43.

4. Codex clii, in quarto, membranaceus, sæculi xii, continet Evangelia Matthæi, Marci, Lucæ, et primum caput Johannis: reliqua injuria temporis exciderunt.

5. Codex clxiii, in octavo, membranaceus, sæculi xi, vel xii, quatuor Evangelia complectitur.

Birch *Prolegomena*, p. 46.

A manuscript of St. Paul's epistles, written in uncial letters, of the most ancient form, and preserved in the library of St. Basilus, is described in Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 213, 214. It is a very ancient codex rescriptus: but I know not whether Birch has collated it, because the second volume of his Greek Testament is not yet published. Montfaucon has likewise described, p. 233. of his *Palæographia*, an *Evangelistarium* written in uncial letters, and preserved in the library of St. Basilus, which Birch has not collated.

CODICES BODLEIANI.

PAGE 223.

69. The manuscripts preserved in the Bodleian library in Oxford are enumerated in the *Catal. MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ*, Tom. I. P. I. p. 1—374. The seven manuscripts of the Greek Testament, here mentioned by our author, are particularly described in Mill's *Prolegomena*, § 1423—1429. It must be observed that the numbers 1, 2, &c. which are here affixed to them, are not the marks by which they are noted in the Bodleian, but by which Mill quoted them. Those who are acquainted with German literature will find a critical examination of the readings of Codd. Bodl. 1, 2, 6, 7. in Semler's *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 257—264. of the Codd. 3, 4, 5, p. 376, 387—391.

PAGE 224.

70. This MS. was noted Cod. 24, in the library of Marsh, Archbishop of Armagh, before it came into the Bodleian. It is what is called a *Codex rescriptus*, but it differs from the *Codex Ephrem*, which is likewise a *Codex rescriptus*, in having the text of the Greek Testament written over some other text, whereas in the *Codex Ephrem* the Greek Testament is the text over which the works of Ephrem are written. See Griesbach's *Symbolæ*, p. ccii—ccxxiii. This critic was the first who collated it.

COD. BOERNERIANUS.

PAGE 225.

71. Professor Matthæi the editor of the *Codex Boernerianus*, which was published at Meissen in Saxony in 1791, relates in his preface, p. 15. that an uniformity in the hand-writing, and a similarity in the colour of the ink,
evince

evince that both the Greek and Latin texts proceeded from the same transcriber.

72. Apparatus criticus, p. 319. ed. 2^{da}.

73. There is no such word as *coornatus*, and, if there were, it does not appear how a compound of *orno* could have been used as a translation of *συμμορφωμενος*. We have here an instance where the Latin appears to have been altered from the Greek, not the Greek from the Latin, and the origin of *συνφορτιζομενος* may perhaps be explained in the following manner. The reading of the Alexandrinus and of the Claromontanus a prima manu is *CYNMOPΦIZOMENOC*, which has precisely the same number of letters as *CYNΦOPTIZOMENOC*. Now, if in an ancient MS. which had the former reading, that is perfectly synonymous to the common one, the letter M and a part of the Φ were faded, a transcriber might easily mistake the latter for a T, in which case he would naturally conclude that the totally faded letter was a Φ. Through this mistake of a transcriber *συνφορτιζομενος* being introduced into the Greek, the reading of the Vulgate 'configuratus' was altered to 'cooneratus,' in order to make it correspond to the Greek text. A similar examination of other examples which have been alleged to prove, that the Greek has been altered from the Latin, might frequently shew that those very examples evince that the charge should be inverted. With respect to this instance in particular, the reading 'cooneratus morti ipsius' is absolute nonsense, and could arise only from ignorance and error.

74. This conclusion is totally ungrounded, for a similarity between the Greek and the Latin affords no more reason to conclude that the former has been altered from the latter, than the latter from the former. But a circumstance, with which our author must have been unacquainted, decides in favour of the Greek. The transcriber has written over *αναψυχω* not only *refrigerem*, but also *refrigerer*; a clear proof that he designed to adapt the Latin to the Greek, and that he was in doubt whether he should ascribe to *αναψυχω* an active or a passive

five sense. Now as *αναπαυω* and *αναψυχω* both signify recreo, it is most reasonable to ascribe the origin of the latter to a transcriber, who copied not word for word, but, having fixed in his memory the sense of a whole period, substituted by mistake a synonymous expression, which occurred to him instead of the genuine reading. The ignorant writer of the Codex Boernerianus, who copied from a manuscript in which he found *αναψυχω*, takes it in the sense of *refrigero*, though he doubts whether it should be active or passive, and produces, as in the former instance, perfect nonsense in the Latin translation.

PAGE 226.

75. But he seems to have had exactly enough to enable him to corrupt the Latin.

76. This opinion has been very ably combated by Dr. Semler, in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. IV. p. 66—84. where he has shewn that the Boernerianus is not a copy of the Augiensis.

77. Wetstein has actually quoted the two suspicious readings which our author means, namely, *τῷ ευαγγελίῳ*, Phil. i. 27. and *συνφορτιζόμενος*, iii. 10. the former from the Boernerianus alone, the latter both from the Augiensis and Boernerianus. Now as Wetstein himself collated the Augiensis, we might conclude that it contained the latter reading, but not the former. I have myself consulted the Augiensis in these passages, and found that Phil. i. 27. the reading is *ΑΞΕΙΩΘ. ΤΟ. ΕΤΑΓΓΕΛΙΟ. ΤΟΥ ΧΡΥ.* which is meant for *αξιως τῷ ευαγγελίῳ τὸ χρις*, and Phil. iii. 10. *ΕΤΝΦΟΡΤΕΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΣ*. Wetstein therefore is guilty only of half the charge which is laid to him by our author.

78. I have translated this sentence word for word, but am wholly unable to comprehend its meaning. It seems to be our author's intention to censure Wetstein, but from his words alone it is impossible to comprehend in what respects Wetstein is here inaccurate. This learned
critic

critic has quoted the Augiensis for *εκαστοι σκοπευντες*, from his own collation, and from the Boernerianus, on the authority of Küster; but it appears that Küster was mistaken, for the Boernerianus has *εκαστοις κοπευντες*. But the Latin translation is not *singuli laborantes*, but *singuli laborantes et quærentes*: it is therefore another instance in this manuscript, where the Greek has been falsely written by mistake, and the Latin corrupted from it by design. The ignorant writer of the Codex Boernerianus falsely divides *ΕΚΑΣΤΟΙΣΚΟΠΟΥΝΤΕΣ*, as it stood in the ancient and probably valuable manuscript, from which he copied, into *εκαστοις κοπευντες*, instead of *εκαστοι σκοπευντες*, writes over *κοπευντες*, his own translation *laborantes*, adds *quærentes*, the translation of *σκοπευντες*, because he found it in a Latin version, forgets to alter *singuli* to *singulis*, which he ought to have done, in order to make the corruption of the Latin consistent with itself, and produces a sentence wholly devoid of meaning.

79. The examples hitherto alleged afford no argument whatsoever in favour of the opinion that the Greek text of the Codex Boernerianus has been altered from the Latin, but on the contrary are incontestable proofs that the Latin translation in this manuscript has been adapted to the Greek. The imperfections therefore, which are visible in this copy of St. Paul's epistles, must be ascribed to the ignorance of the transcriber, not to intentional alteration; and we may safely subscribe to the opinion of Dr. Semler, in his edition of *Wetstenii Libelli*, p. 189. *Codices isti quatuor, D, E, F, G, sunt græcolatini, quos solent contemnere, sed facile tandem patebit magno in honore a nobis habendos esse, qui servant alius vetustioris recensionis multa præclara monumenta.*

80. But there is a vacant space of six lines at the end of the 14th. chapter. See Matthäi's edition, fol. 18.

81. The Codex Boernerianus appears to have been written in an age when the transition was making from the uncial to the small character. In some respects it may be said to be written in capitals, but they are small and

and round, except at the beginning of a sentence, where they are much larger. We find likewise several small letters, *α, κ, ρ*, &c. but if we except the initials, they are all of the same size. The words are very distinctly divided. In the Latin translation the letters *r, s,* and *t*, correspond to that form which is found in the Anglo-saxon alphabet; a proof that this manuscript was written in the West of Europe, and probably between the eighth and twelfth centuries. See the fac simile published by Matthäi, fol. 23. A copy of the Codex Boernerianus is now preserved in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, among the books and manuscripts that were left by Dr. Bentley, who probably procured this transcript for his intended edition of the Greek Testament. It is true that no mention is made in any part of this copy, that it was taken from the Codex Boernerianus. But that it is a modern transcript of an ancient manuscript, appears from its being written on very fresh paper, and the Greek being in uncial letters, and the Latin in Anglo-saxon characters. And that this ancient manuscript is the Codex Boernerianus, is evident from the following circumstances, 1. Both the Greek and Latin letters in the MS. in Trinity College are evident imitations of the Codex Boernerianus. 2. The Latin and Greek texts are interlined; and the Codex Boernerianus is the only MS. of St. Paul's epistles written in that manner. 3. I have compared a great number of readings, which are found in the Codex Boernerianus alone, and have discovered them all in the manuscript in question. To mention only two or three in particular. Rom. i. 6. *ἐν ἀγαπῇ*. Rom. i. 15. *ἐν Ρωμῇ* is omitted. Phil. i. 27. *ἀξίως τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*. In the Latin the singular readings *refrigerem* *t* *refrigerer*, Rom. xv. 32. and *laborantes* *t* *quærentes*, Phil. ii. 4. And a vacant space of six lines is left at the end of Rom. xiv. precisely as in the Codex Boernerianus. Besides, it is certain that Bentley had the Codex Boernerianus five years in his hands. He borrowed it from Boerner, who had some difficulty in getting it

it again. See the Catalogus Bibl. Boernerianæ, p. 6. or the Preface to Matthäi's edition of the Codex Boernerianus, p. 18.

82. See Note 79.

PAGE 227.

83. The Codex Boernerianus was published by Matthäi at Meissen in Saxony, in 1791. See Note 4. to sect. 4. of this chapter.

CODEx BONONIENSIS.

Here may be inserted the Codex Bononiensis, of which Professor Birch, in his Prolegomena, p. 54. gives the following description. Bononiæ, in bibliotheca canonico-rum regularium codicem vidi signatum 640, qui integrum N. T. continet excepta Apocalypsi. Scriptus est sæculo ut opinor xi. in membranis. A catalogue of the Codd. Bononienses in general is given in Montfaucon Bibl. bibliothecarum, Tom. I. p. 431.

CODEx BOREELI.

84. By whom the collation was made is unknown: all that Wettstein says is, Paulo post mortem Boreeli (A. C. 1629.) vir quidam doctus contulit cum editis Matthæum, Marcum, et Lucæ capita priora, quam collationem mecum communicavit A. 1730. Isaacus Verburgius, Gymnasii Amstelodamensis Rector.

CODICES BORGIANI.

PAGE 228.

85. Professor Birch has collated this fragment, described it in his Prolegomena, p. 49. and communicated its various readings in his Greek Testament, Vol. I. p. 569—592. under the title Borgianus 1. The whole of it is printed in Georgii fragmentum Græco-Copto-
VOL. II. U u Thebaicum,

Thebaicum, Romæ 1789, 4to. Birch has likewise described, and communicated the readings of the two following Borgian manuscripts.

2. Borgianus 2, membranaceus, sæculi ut videtur xi, quatuor evangelia complectitur.

3. Borgianus 3, membranaceus, sæculi xii, pericopas evangeliorum et epistolarum Pauli complectitur.

C O D E X B U N K L E.

86. Our author seems to have mistaken Wetstein, in saying that the manuscript was brought to England in 1476, for Wetstein's words express a different meaning, Codex D. Bunkle, Londinensis IV. Evangeliorum scriptus post inventionem artis typographicæ a Georgio Spartiata, qui A°. 1476, a Sixto IV. Papa in Angliam missus est, teste Allatio de Georgiis. It is evident that 'missus est' can have no relation to the manuscript, which might have been written by George of Sparta, even after his embassy to England. When Mill collated this manuscript, it was the property of Mr. Bunkle of London, but Wetstein has not mentioned where it was deposited, when he examined it. At present it is preserved in the University Library of Cambridge, where it is marked Ll, 2, 13, At least the manuscript thus marked perfectly corresponds to Wetstein's description of the Codex D. Bunkle. At the end of St. John's Gospel is a subscription, which begins and ends in the following manner: *Εβλεπωθη η παρσα βιβλος εν τη Γαλιλα, εν τη πολει τε Παρισιε.*—*Μνηνην εχειω Γεωργιε Ειρμωνυμε τε Σπαρτιατα, ος ταυτην εγραψεν.* It has not the ancient κεφαλαια, but the modern chapters, which are found in our printed Bibles. Before it came into the University Library it belonged to Bishop Moore, who, if it is the same as Mill's Codex Bu, must have purchased it after the death of Mr. Bunkle.

C O D E X C A M E R A R I I.

87. The last edition of the commentary of Camera-rius, was printed at Cambridge in 1642, under the following

lowing title : *Joachimi Camerarii commentarius in Novum Fœdus elaboratus, nunc denuo plurimum illustratus et locupletatus*. It is bound with Beza's Greek Testament, printed at Cambridge in the same year.

CODEx CANTABRIGIENSIS.

PAGE 229.

88. Our author neglects here to mention one of the best critical descriptions that have been given of the Codex Cantabrigiensis, which is that of Dr. Semler, in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 99—137. though he recommends Semler's essay on this manuscript, which is printed at the end of his edition of Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 593—615. It is necessary therefore to observe, that the recommended essay contains principles, which that eminent critic has since that time totally abandoned. He wrote it so early as the year 1764, at a time when his own private reflexion had not yet divested him of the prejudices acquired by the study of Wetstein; he institutes therefore in this essay, a comparison between the Cod. Cant. and the old Latin versions, and concludes, agreeably to the principles of his great master, that the former had been altered from the latter. But in his *Spicilegium observationum*, published in 1766, he revokes these principles, saying, p. 178. *Fui autem et ipse nuper adhuc in hac sententia, quæ est plerorumque doctorum virorum: sed non licet mihi amplius eam tenere, aut hunc codicem, et græco-latinos tam vehementer adspernari*. He then concludes, *Itaque istæ accusationes omnes vanæ sunt jam et temerariæ*. In his subsequent writings, enumerated Note 1. to sect. 3. he has continued the inquiry, shewn the invalidity of the commonly received opinion, and introduced a system of criticism, that has been adopted and defended by Griesbach and Woide, and is at present received by every critic in Europe. A description of this MS. is given in Mill's Proleg. § 1268—1273. Simon, in his *Hist. crit. du texte du N. T.* sect. 30. has also treated of it, and

Blanchini, in his *Evangeliarum quadruplex*, P. I. p. 481—484.

89. In his *Symbolæ*, p. lviii—lxi. but he has taken notice only of a few corrections in a few chapters of St. Matthew, for he says himself, *Mutandum erat hoc consilium, quoniam tam difficili negotio, dignoscendisque omnium correctorum manibus, plus temporis impendendum fuisset, quam consecrare ei possem.* In the edition, shortly to be published by Dr. Kipling, these corrections will be accurately noted. Our author has neglected to mention that some pages of this MS. containing Mat. iii. 8—16. John xviii. 13.—xx. 13. Mark xvi. 15. to the end, are written by a later hand, which Wettstein (*Prol.* p. 31.) refers to the tenth century, but Griesbach (*Symb.* p. lvii.) to the twelfth. In Wettstein's description of the chasms of this MS. there is an erratum, (*Prol.* p. 30.) viz. for John i. 16.—ii. 26. must be read John i. 16.—iii. 36.

90. Wettstein was of opinion, and in this opinion he was generally followed, till Semler ventured to call it in question, that the Codex Bezae contained a Greek text, which was altered from the Latin, or, in other words, that the writer of the Codex Bezae departed from the readings of the Greek manuscript, or manuscripts, from which he copied, and introduced in their stead, from some Latin version, readings which were warranted by the authority of no Greek manuscript. Now it is true, that a very great number of the readings peculiar to the Codex Bezae are found in the Vulgate, as appears from consulting Wettstein's Greek Testament, where the Codex D, and the Vulgate, are frequently quoted together for readings, that are found in no Greek manuscript at present known: and I have myself collated the two first chapters of St. Mark, with the old Latin versions published by Blanchini, and have found that in most of the readings, in which the Codex Bezae differs from all the Greek manuscripts, it agrees with some one of those Latin versions. But shall we therefore conclude that those readings were actually borrowed from a Latin version, and translated into Greek? It is at least as possible that they might have had their origin in the Greek,

as in the Latin, and this very possibility is sufficient to defeat the whole of Wettstein's hypothesis. Griesbach very properly observes on this subject, (Symbolæ, p. cxi.) 'Vehementer errant, qui e consensu codicis cujusdam cum versione latina illum ex hac interpolatum esse effici posse putant. Non e latinis sed e græcis libris recensio- nis occidentalis derivandæ sunt ejusmodi lectiones, nisi forte manifestum sit, oriri eas non potuisse in græcis co- dicibus, contra vero origo earum facillime e latina ver- sione explicari queat. Exempla vero pleraque, quibus viri docti ad declarandam codicum quorundam antiquis- simorum e latina translatione interpolationem usi sunt, nil præter illorum cum hac *consensum* ostendunt, neuti- quam vero *istos ex hac corruptos esse* probant. Lectiones enim, ad quos provocant viri docti, sunt fere interpreta- menta, glossæ, additamenta et omissiones, quæ omnia cur a latinis in græcos, potius quam *e græcis in latinos* codices immigrasse statuamus, causâ appareat plane nulla, cum græci librarii, grammatici, et scholiastæ, æque at- que latini homines, talia comminisci potuerint.' Fur- ther, it is not only as possible that these peculiar read- ings took their rise in the Greek as in the Latin, but highly probable that they did so. It is surely more rea- sonable to suppose, that a translation would be altered from an original, than an original from a translation: and this supposition is confirmed by fact, for when Jerom revised the Latin version by order of Pope Damasus, he corrected it from Greek manuscripts. Besides, the Co- dex Bezae has additions, omissions, and transpositions, which are found neither in the Vulgate, nor any other Latin version now extant. For instance, Mark i. 8. the clause *ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω* (al. *ἐβαπτισα*) *ἐν ὕδατι*, is transferred to the seventh verse: Luke vi. 5. *καὶ ελεγεὺς αὐτοῖς, ὅτι κύριος ἐστὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββατοῦ*, is transferred to the tenth verse, and in its stead is a long passage, consisting of not less than twenty-eight words. Of these alterations no trace is to be found, either in the Vulgate, or in the old Latin versions published by Blan- chini. Many more examples of this kind might be pro-

duced from the Gospels: and if we have recourse to the Acts of the Apostles, we shall find examples, that are still more striking. In the two instances above-mentioned, as well as in most other places, the Latin text of the Codex Bezae corresponds to the Greek. Since, therefore, the Latin version of that manuscript agrees with the Greek text, even in places where it is supported by no Latin manuscript at present known, we must conclude that the Latin was adapted to the Greek, not the Greek to the Latin. Indeed, if so eminent a critic as Wetstein had not advanced the opinion, it would seem absurd, where the Greek occupies the first page, the Latin the second, and the latter is annexed to the former as a mean of understanding it, to imagine that the readings of the original were adapted to those of the translation. That the Codex Bezae very frequently agrees, either with the Vulgate, or some other Latin version, is by no means extraordinary, when we reflect that this manuscript is one of the oldest now extant, and that the Greek manuscripts, from which the Latin versions were made, come nearer to it in point of time, than to those Greek manuscripts, from which the Codex Bezae differs. The authors of these Latin versions must have found in the Greek manuscripts, from which they translated, the readings, which are common to them, and to the Codex Bezae: and this very agreement, instead of shewing these readings to be spurious, is a strong argument that they are ancient and genuine. To this must be added, that a great number of these readings are found in the Syriac, the Coptic, the Sahidic, the margin of the Philoxenian version, the Versio Syra Hierosolymitana, and the quotations of Origen. Now we must suppose that all these have been corrupted from the Latin, if the charge be true with respect to the Codex Bezae. In proof of this charge, Wetstein has produced, in his Prolegomena, p. 32. fourteen examples, in which he says the Codex Bezae has clearly been corrupted from the Latin: and adds, *Obtestor hic omnes sano judicio praeditos, ac literarum Graecarum peritos, judicent utra lectio*

lectio sit sincerior, illane quam nostri codices exhibent, an quam Morinus ex Codice Bezae Græco-Latino protulit? To this we may answer, that the purity of a reading is no proof of its authenticity, in a work, that is confessedly written in impure Greek, and that of these fourteen examples there are several, which may rather be ascribed to accident, than design. In short, there is no reason whatsoever for ascribing any reading of a Greek manuscript to the influence of the Latin, unless it can be proved that it could not have taken its rise in the Greek, and that it might easily have originated in the Latin. An instance of this kind is in the Codex Montfortianus, 1 John v. 6. where instead of the common reading πνευμα, we find χρισος. Now, as the Latin words ‘spiritus’ and ‘Christus,’ are written in the old Latin manuscripts \overline{XPS} and \overline{SPS} , (Pref. to Casley’s Catalogue, p. 22.) it was easy to exchange the words in the Latin, but not so easy in the Greek. In this case therefore, we must ascribe the reading χρισος to the influence of the Latin: but no instance of this kind has been produced from the Codex Bezae.

PAGE 230.

91. See Wettstein’s Note to Matth. iii. 16.

92. See Knittel’s edition of Ulphilæ versio Gothica nonnullorum capitum epistolæ ad Romanos, p. 283. where the origin of this reading is explained as an error of a transcriber, who copied from a MS. in which the canons of Eusebius were noted in the margin; this learned critic conjectures that καταλειπον in the ancient MS. from which the Cod. Bezae was copied, stood at the end of the line, that α was noted in the margin parallel to it, and with a small interval, that the transcriber imagined therefore, that it belonged to the word in the text, and that in the interval a letter was faded, which he supposed to be τ, and wrote therefore καταλειποντα. It is true that this is mere conjecture, but the conjecture is certainly ingenious: and that it is not devoid of probability, appears from the circumstance, that the letter Α is actually the reference to the

canons of Eusebius, Matth. iii. 16. as may be seen on consulting Stephens's or Küster's edition.

93. The reading of the Codex Veronensis is, *et alia die cum exisset a Bethania*, but that of the Vercellensis agrees word for word with the reading of the Latin text of the Cantabrigiensis.

94. Not only in some cases, but perhaps in most cases, the Latin text has been altered from the Greek in the Codices Græco-Latini in general, where the Greek has been supposed to have been altered from the Latin. See the Notes 73—79. 90.

95. Namely, the only two manuscripts containing the Latin version, in which this reading is omitted, it being omitted in the best Greek manuscripts, and therefore rejected by Griesbach from the text of his edition.

PAGE 281.

96. As the Cod. Cant. was probably written in Europe, as appears from its being accompanied with a Latin translation, it seems improbable that the Syriac version should have been used in the correction of a manuscript, written in a country where the Syriac language was wholly unknown; and the only supposition that can make the conjecture probable, is, that the Greek text of the Cod. Cant. was taken from a Greek manuscript written in Asia. But even for this conjecture there seems to be no necessity, for the examples produced by Storr, in proof of his hypothesis, are not wholly satisfactory. The first is that which has been already quoted by our author, Mark xi. 12. where the Syriac version expresses '*cum exisset e Bethania, esuriit,*' and the Cod. Cant. has *ἐξελθὼν ἀπο τῆς Βηθανίας ἐπεινασεν*. Now a critical correction implies a knowledge at least of the language in which the correction is made, but the writer of this passage in the Cod. Cant. has discovered no critical knowledge of Greek, since he has converted *ἐπεινασεν* into an impersonal verb, and made it to govern *ἐξελθὼν*. The alteration therefore may be ascribed rather to error, or carelessness, than to actual design; and it is probably
mere

mere accident that both the Cod. Cant. and the old Syriac version express the participle in question in the singular. Those who would examine the other examples, will find them in Storr's *Observationes super Vers. Syr.* p. 15, 16.

97. See Chap. vii. sect. 11. That one of the Greek manuscripts, collated at Alexandria by Thomas of Harkel, in the seventh century, for his edition of the Philoxenian version, had readings similar to those which are at present found in the Codex Cantabrigiensis, no one has pointed out with so much clearness and precision as Professor Adler. This learned and ingenious writer, in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 79—133. has given a collation of the marginal readings of this version in the four Gospels, with several Greek MSS. especially the Alexandrinus Vaticanus, Ephrem, Cantabrigiensis, and Stephani octavus, the result of which collation (see p. 130.) is, that nineteen readings, found in no other Greek MS. than the Cantabrigiensis, are noted in the margin of the Philoxenian version, viz. Matth. i. 7. viii. 28. ix. 15. xv. 6. xx. 28. Mark i. 3. iv. 9. vii. 13. Luke vii. 1. 41. xii. 1, 2. xviii. 30. 34. xx. 36. xxii. 34. John vi. 1. vii. 40. ix. 37: also six that are in no other manuscripts than the Cantabrigiensis and Vaticanus, and twenty-five which the Cantabrigiensis has in common with some few other manuscripts. It is well known that this extraordinary coincidence, which was first observed by Wettstein, induced that eminent critic to suppose that the Cod. Cant. was actually one of those Greek manuscripts which Thomas collated, and of which he wrote the readings in the margin. But this is a subject, that will be examined in the sequel. See Note 122.

98. Namely, *ⲧⲉ ⲕⲓⲃⲉⲥ*, which is found in no other MS. than the Cant., is expressed in the Coptic version.

PAGE 232.

99. The example taken from Mark iii. 21. is more decisive, than that taken from ver. 29. because the former, which is a very remarkable reading, is found in the Cant. alone,

alone, whereas the latter is found in two other manuscripts. Many other examples of coincidence in singular readings might be selected from Wettstein, or Griesbach: but no one has examined this subject with so much accuracy as Semler, who, in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 126—135. has instituted a comparison between the Cod. Cant. and the Coptic version, also with the Ethiopic, the Armenian, and the Alexandrine fathers, and the result of this inquiry is, that the Greek text of the Cod. Cant. belongs to the Alexandrine edition, and that the original, from which it was copied, was written in Egypt.

100. Our author has here printed a list of examples, communicated to him by Woide, in which the Sahidic version agrees with the Cod. Cantabrigiensis, but the most complete information on this subject is to be had in Dr. Münster's *Dissertatio de indole versionis Sahidicæ*, p. 10—46. where he has instituted a very accurate comparison between the Cod. Cant. and the Sahidic version.

To the ancient versions mentioned by our author, may be added at present the *Versio Syra Hierosolymitana*, described by Adler in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 137—202. He has collated this version with the readings of the Cod. Cant. and discovered in it eleven readings, that exist in no other Greek manuscript now extant, fourteen which are found only in one or two manuscripts beside the Codex Cant., and fifty-four which are common to the Codex Cant. and several other manuscripts.

101. For that reason Dr. Harwood, in his edition of the Greek Testament, published in London in 1776, has regulated his text in the Gospels, and the Acts, chiefly according to the readings of the Cambridge manuscript. See his preface, p. 7.

PAGE 233.

102. The Cod. Corbeiensis 1. is that which was published by Blanchini, who terms it Cod. Corb. 195: the Cod. Corb. 2. was published by Sabatier, who terms it Cod. Corb. 21. These two manuscripts were noted 1. 2. by

by Griesbach. See his preface, p. 23, 24. Our author quotes only the Corb. 2. for ‘iratus,’ but it is also in the Corb. 1. See Blanchini Evangeliarium quadruplex, P. II. p. 318.

103. That other ancient Greek manuscripts had *ἐν πλατειᾷ*, appears from the Gothic version, which was immediately translated from the Greek, and expresses this reading.

104. In the Lex. Hept. the sense only of ‘platea,’ not that of ‘forum,’ is ascribed to *πλατεῖα*. With respect to this reading, it is more reasonable to ascribe it to accident, than to seek for a mysterious reason that never existed. As the Greek *πλατεῖα*, as well as the Latin ‘platea,’ signifies not a public road, but a broad street, or open place in a town, it is almost synonymous to *αγορά*, and was probably substituted by mistake in the hurry of copying.

PAGE 234.

105. It is not improbable that *καὶ νουν βρωθῇ* was written in the margin of some ancient MS. opposite to Luke xxii. 16. because in the parallel passages, Matth. xxvi. 29. Mark xiv. 25. the expression *καὶ νουν πινω* is used. Or the reading of the Cod. Cant. arose perhaps in the following manner. In the manuscript from which it was copied, the three first letters of ΠΛΗΡΩΘΗ being partly faded, the transcriber, as the subject related to eating, took the remnant of H for B, and supposed that the verb was ΒΡΩΘΗ; the remnant of ΠΛ, which he was obliged to fill up by the help of his imagination, he took for ΚΝ, and writes ΚΑΙΝΟΝ ΒΡΩΘΗ. But the former conjecture is the most probable.

106. Namely, in the Evangeliarium quadruplex, P. I. p. 315. But our author must have written this sentence without consulting the work to which he appeals, for the Codex Veronensis has not ‘in fines,’ but ‘in partes,’ and the Vercellensis, Corbeiensis, and Brixianus, are wholly devoid of an addition of this kind.

107. The

107. The Latin reading is taken not only chiefly, but wholly from the Greek; for the very mistake of the copyist, in writing *περί αὐτῶν* twice, (which our author, however, has not noted, and which I have supplied from Wetstein, because I have found it in the manuscript itself) is faithfully transplanted into the Latin, where we find ‘*pro eo,*’ and ‘*super ipso.*’

108. The Cantabrigiensis, and the Cyprius, are the only two Greek manuscripts, which here retain the genuine reading.

PAGE 236.

109. Beza wrote, in the beginning of this manuscript, the following account with his own hand. *Est hoc exemplar venerandæ vetustatis ex Græcia, ut apparet ex barbaris quibusdam Græcis ad marginem notatis, olim exportatum, et in S. Irenæi monasterio Lugdunensi, ita, ut hic cernitur, mutilatum, postquam ibi in pulvere diu jacuisset, repertum, oriente ibi civili bello anno Domini 1562.* He gives the same account in his letter to the University of Cambridge, dated *Genevæ Id. Decemb. 1581*, and thirdly, in the page preceding the preface to his edition of the Greek Testament, printed in 1582. Now we must here distinguish conjecture, from evidence. That the manuscript came originally from Greece, is conjecture: but that it was discovered in the monastery of St. Irenæus in Lyons, in 1562, is the direct and positive evidence of a man, whose veracity we have no reason to doubt: and, since he has given it at three different times, and all three times his accounts agree, there seems to be no reason for calling his evidence in question, till evidence as positive can be produced to the contrary.

PAGE 237.

110. See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 29. 36. But that the Codex β is never quoted in Stephens's margin, where the Codex Bezae has a chasm, and that the Codex β has 450 lectiones singulares, is a mistake. I have care-

carefully counted them, and found only 211 lectiones singulares quoted from the Cod. β ; viz. 63 in Matthew, 51 in Mark, 36 in Luke, 28 in John, and 33 in the Acts. In conjunction with other manuscripts, the Cod. β is quoted by Stephens 128 times, viz. in Matthew 39, in Mark 32, in Luke 29, in John 17, and in the Acts 11. The whole number of times therefore that the Cod. β is quoted, both with and without other manuscripts, amounts only to 339. The other position likewise, that the Codex β is no where quoted in Stephens's margin, where the Codex Bezae has a chasm, is not true. For the Codex Bezae has a chasm Matthew xxvii. 1—12. yet Stephens quotes his Codex β twice in this place, viz. ver. 1. for the reading *εποιησαν*, instead of the common reading *ελαβον*, and ver. 3. for *παραδους*, instead of *παραδιδους*. Again the Codex Bezae has a chasm Acts viii. 29.—x. 14; yet Stephens has quoted his Codex β twice in this interval, viz. ix. 31. *ειχεν ειρηνην οικοδομημενην πορευομενην*, for the common reading *ειχον ειρηνην οικοδομωμεναι και πορευομεναι*, and again at the end of the verse, *επληθυνετο* for *επληθυνοντο*. This is a mere statement of facts, which is designed only to correct our author's too general assertion, and is not written with a view of prejudicing the reader against the opinion, that the Codex Bezae, and the Codex Stephani β , are one and the same manuscript, for at present I do not argue upon these facts. The general evidence for and against the opinion in question, with the exceptions that may be made to the different arguments on each side, will be stated in a subsequent note.

III. Prolegomena, p. 36. Our author's reference to Acts xxi. 35. is an erratum, for the Cod. β is not quoted once in that chapter. The other example, Acts xiii. 1. consists only in the word *Μαναηλ*, quoted by Stephens from the Codex β , and which is not quoted from the Cod. Cant.

III. For examples of Robert Stephens's inaccuracy, in his celebrated edition of the Greek Testament, see Mr.

Mr. Porson's Letters to Archdeacon Travis, p. 78—92. and Le Long's letter to Martin, published in the *Journal des Sçavans*, Vol. LXVII. p. 646.

113. But in the expression *ἡμετεροὶ φίλοι*, Robert Stephens might surely include his son: and that he really meant to do so, though prudential motives induced him at that time to conceal his name, lest the collations should be thought inaccurate, as being made by so young a man, appears from the evidence of Henry Stephens himself. See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 143, 144. where the matter is reduced to a certainty. The expression 'in Italicis,' which Wetstein quotes from Henry Stephens's Preface to the edition of the N. T. of 1587, applies in particular to the Codex β , which was the only manuscript collated in Italy.

PAGE 239.

114. Our author's first objection to Dr. Semler's hypothesis, that the Cod. Stephani β might have been a transcript made from the Codex Bezae, is ungrounded: for he is mistaken in saying, that Semler supposes it to have been made a *short* time before Henry Stephens collated the Cod. β in Italy. Semler uses the word *olim*, and therefore the objection drawn from the word 'vetustissimum' is not valid. His second objection, that a transcript from the Codex Bezae could hardly have been so accurately taken, as to deviate so little from the original, as the Codex Bezae from the readings of the Codex β , is likewise of very little weight, for the differences between the extracts from the Codex Bezae, and the Codex β , are sufficiently numerous to make the hypothesis at least possible. Wetstein himself made his extracts, not from the Codex Bezae, but from a copy of it. At least it is highly probable, for since he transcribed the manuscript, while he was in Cambridge, it is reasonable to suppose that he collated this copy at his leisure, after his return. The anonymous author of the *Specimen animadversionem in prolegomena Wetstenii*, supposes that both the Codex β and the Codex Bezae were
ancient

ancient copies of the same old manuscript, and it is not improbable, that from the same manuscript, from which the Codex Bezae was copied, other transcripts were likewise taken, all of which would be, as Bengel expresses it, of the same family. Now to this hypothesis it has been objected, that it does not account for the extraordinary circumstance of Stephens's never quoting his Codex β , where the Codex Bezae has a chasm, since it cannot be supposed that both copies were defective in the same places. But that this objection is ungrounded, appears from Note 110.

Without deciding on the question, whether the Codex Bezae, and the Codex Stephani β , are one and the same manuscript, or not, I will state, as fairly as I am able, the arguments for and against the question, with the objections, that may be made to each, and leave the determination to the reader.

In favour of the opinion that they are one and the same manuscript, Wettstein alleges, in his Prolegomena, p. 29. 1. That the *lectiones singulares*, quoted in Stephens's margin from the Codex β , agree exactly with those of the Codex Bezae, except in some few instances, which appear to be typographical errors. The same argument he repeats p. 36. and says, that the Codex Bezae, and Codex β , agree in 450 *variationes singulares*. 2. That where the Codex Bezae has chasms, no readings are quoted in Stephens's margin from the Codex β , though, if we except these chasms, the Codex β is quoted by Stephens in every page. 3. That several remarkable additions to the common text, found only in the text of the Codex Bezae, are quoted by Stephens from his Codex β . Of these he gives no examples, but among others, which I have observed, there are two which are very striking, viz. Acts xvi. 38. where the Codex Bezae has a long passage, consisting of not less than forty-nine words, which are found in no other manuscript at present known, and these very words are precisely quoted by Stephens from his Codex β . Another instance is John vi. 56. where a long passage, consisting of one and thirty words,

words, peculiar to the Codex Bezae, are likewise quoted by Stephens from the Codex β . See also Acts vi. 11. xiv. 7. 10. which are examples of the same kind, though less remarkable:

To these arguments may be made the following objections. 1. The *lectiones singulares*, quoted from the Codex β , do not amount to 450, but only to 211. In conjunction with other manuscripts it is quoted 128 times, so that the whole number, both of *lectiones singulares*, and *lectiones communes*, amounts only to 339. See Note 110. But, making all reasonable deductions, it appears that the Codex Bezae, and the Codex β agree in about two hundred readings, which Henry Stephens found in no other manuscript, than his Codex β . We must not however conclude that none of them is contained in any other manuscript, than the Codex Bezae. In order to ascertain this point, as well as our imperfect data permit, I have collated the six first chapters of St. Mark, and have found the proportion to be as follows: Of 28 readings, which Stephens quotes from the Codex β alone, there are 19 which Wettstein quotes from the Codex Bezae alone, 8 which he quotes from other manuscripts, as well as the Codex Bezae, and one where the Codex Bezae and Codex β do not perfectly agree. If we argue therefore by analogy, from these six chapters to the whole manuscript, we shall find that of the 211 readings, quoted by Stephens from the Codex β alone, 143 are found in the Codex Bezae, and in the Codex Bezae alone, at least of the manuscripts, that were known to Wettstein. And of these 143 *lectiones singulares*, there are several which are very long, and very remarkable. Now, as it seems improbable, that so extraordinary a manuscript as the Codex β should be totally lost in times devoted to critical inquiry, which must be the case, if the Codex β was a different manuscript from the Codex Bezae, it is reasonable to conclude, if we argue from this coincidence, that they are one and the same manuscript. 2. To the second argument it may be replied, that the premises are not perfectly true, for the

the Codex β is actually quoted by Stephens in four instances, where the Codex Bezae has a chasm. For this manuscript is defective, Matth. xxvii. 1—12. and Acts viii. 29.—x. 14.; yet Stephens quotes from his Codex β the reading $\epsilon\omega\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ for $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\nu$, Matth. xxvii. 1. and $\omega\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ as a various reading to $\omega\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, Matth. xxvii. 3. Again, Acts ix. 31. he quotes from his Cod. β the various reading $\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\nu\eta\nu$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$ $\omega\omicron\rho\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$, and at the end of the verse $\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\theta\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$. Here, however, it must be remarked, that immediately before these two last-mentioned quotations from the Cod. β , Stephens quotes $\eta \mu\epsilon\nu \epsilon\nu \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ from the Codex δ . Now it is evident that these three readings were taken from the same manuscript, for they only differ from the common text in having the noun, the participle, and the verb in the singular, instead of the plural. The compositor therefore must have made a mistake, either in setting δ for β in the first instance, or β for δ in the two last. But as one mistake might more easily happen than two, the probability is in favour of the opinion that δ is a mistake, and that all three should be β . But if we admit that this example is neutral, the others still remain in force, unless they be explained as typographical errors. Besides, it is not true that the Codex β is quoted in every page of Stephens's margin, where the Codex Bezae is not defective. For this manuscript has no chasm in any part of the Gospel of St. Luke; yet in this Gospel alone there are not less than twelve whole pages, in which neither the letter β , nor the letter ω , appears in Stephens's margin, which last abbreviation, had it been used, might have been supposed to include the Codex β . There are also three other pages, in which the Codex β is not quoted by name, but only included, if included at all, under the word $\omega\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. Even therefore, if it were admitted, that every one of the quotations from the Codex β , in the places where the Codex Bezae has chasms, were typographical errors, yet this argument of Wetstein would still be inconclusive.

In favour of the opinion, that the Codex Bezae and the Codex β are two distinct manuscripts, may be alleged the following arguments. 1. It appears from the direct and positive evidence of Beza, which he has given in a clear and consistent manner three different times, (see Note 109.) that his manuscript of the Gospels and Acts was discovered in the monastery of St. Irenæus at Lyons, in 1562, and that from all the intelligence, which he was able to procure, it had lain there time immemorial. If this account be true, the Codex Bezae could not possibly have been collated in Italy by Henry Stephens, fifteen years prior to that period, and the manuscript, which Stephens collated, must now lie buried in some Italian library. 2. Henry Stephens, who collated the Cod. β , who lived in habits of intimacy with Beza, and printed some of his editions of the Greek Testament, must unavoidably have been led by the same curiosity, which induced him to examine every Greek manuscript, which he could procure, to inspect at least the two celebrated manuscripts, which Beza used in his edition of 1582, and in which Henry Stephens himself wrote the *Exhortatio ad Lectorem*. If therefore Beza's manuscript of the Gospels and Acts had been the very same, which he himself had collated a few years before, he must have recognized so remarkable a manuscript, and of course would have mentioned it to Beza. But Stephens has no where given the least hint of its being the same, though he had a fair opportunity of doing it, where he speaks of the manuscripts, which he himself had collated, namely in the preface to the edition of the Greek Testament of 1587, printed five years after Beza's third edition, (*Wetstenii Prolegom.* p. 143.); and Beza constantly quotes it as a different manuscript from the Cod. Stephani β . 3. In four instances where the Codex Bezae is defective, Stephens quotes readings from his Codex β . See the preceding paragraph, with the observations on the two last examples. 4. The author of the *Specimen animadversionum in prolegomena Wetstenii* has produced twenty readings, in which the Codex Bezae

Bezae and the Codex β contradict each other. Wetstein however has shewn, (Prol. p. 36, 37.) that the greatest part of them are without force. For four of them are quoted by Stephens, not from the Codex β in particular, but as being *εν πασι*, an expression which is too general for the foundation of an argument, relative to any one in particular. Of the other sixteen examples, he has shewn that five differ rather in appearance than reality, and that the words quoted by Stephens are actually in the Codex Bezae. For the difference, which is visible in two other examples, he accounts by saying, that Stephens quotes for them other manuscripts, beside the Codex β , and that to save himself trouble, he annexed the letter β to a reading found in another manuscript, because the difference between them was immaterial. One of these examples is Acts iii. 1. where the Codex Bezae has *επι το αυτο εν τη εκκλησια. Εν δε ταις ημεραις εκειναις Πετρος*, instead of which reading, Stephens quotes from his two manuscripts noted β and ϵ , the following reading, *τη εκκλησια επι το αυτο. Πετρος δε*. This is no immaterial difference, as Wetstein terms it, and his answer is not satisfactory. Of the remaining examples, he shews that one has too trifling a difference to be worthy of notice, and to that which is taken from Acts viii. 6. he replies, that the Codex Bezae has there two readings, and that, though the reading produced by Mill differs from Stephens's quotation, the latter is found in the Codex Bezae, a secundâ manu. In the two examples which are taken from Matth. ix. 20. x. 25. he makes it probable that β is a typographical error, in the one instance for η , in the other for α . But still there are four examples remaining, namely Matth. xii. 22. Luke ii. 21. iii. 19. viii. 18. in which the Codex β and Codex Bezae contradict each other, and which are only supposed to be typographical errors. Indeed two of them Wetstein has left wholly unnoticed, Luke ii. 21. iii. 19. though he finishes his examination with the words 'en viginti illa loca excussa.' And these four are the result, not of a collation of the

whole manuscript, but only of 19 chapters in St. Matthew, 8 in St. Luke, and 15 in the Acts. I have made no regular collation, with a view of discovering contradictions between the Codex Bezae, and the Codex Stephani β , but I have found one by accident, John xiii. 2. where Stephens quotes a reading from the latter, which is not in the former: and if the whole of Stephens's margin was collated, it is possible that many more would be found. Now if we contend that each example of this kind is a typographical error, it may be said we are guilty of a *petitio principii*. When two different critics are known to have taken their extracts from one and the same manuscript, as we know that Mill and Wetstein did from the Codex Bezae, we have a certain criterion, from which we can safely pronounce, that, in every instance, in which their extracts differ, an error must have taken place either of the writer, or of the printer. But if instead of arguing synthetically, we are obliged to proceed by the method of analysis, and the identity of the manuscript is the thing to be ascertained, which can be proved by no other method, than by a comparison of the extracts from the two supposed different manuscripts, we must be content to take the data, such as we find them; for if we new-model them according to a pre-assumed hypothesis, we are taking for granted the thing to be proved. 5. Though the characteristic readings of the Codex β are found in general in the Codex Bezae, yet on the other hand there are some very long and remarkable readings in the Cod. Bezae, which Stephens has not quoted from his Codex β . For instance that extraordinary passage, Matth. xx. 28. $\nu\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$, $\kappa\ \tau\ \lambda$. consisting of not less than sixty words, which exist in no other manuscript at present known, than the Codex Bezae, is not quoted by Stephens from his Codex β . It may be said therefore, that if the Codex Bezae had been the manuscript, which Henry Stephens collated, he could not possibly have overlooked so long and so remarkable a passage. Whatever latitude be given to Henry Stephens's negligence, he was certainly not inattentive

attentive to this chapter; for he has quoted his Codex β several times in it, for readings of infinitely less importance, than the reading in question. And, what is most extraordinary of all, he has quoted $\epsilon\varsigma\omega$ as a various reading to $\epsilon\varsigma\omega$, ver. 27. and noted likewise the omission of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\omicron\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \omicron\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\iota$, ver. 34. and yet does not perceive any remarkable interpolation *between* these two verses. It seems therefore reasonable to conclude, that the manuscript, collated by Henry Stephens, had *not* the interpolation in question, and of course was a different manuscript from the Codex Bezae. Should it be objected that, as H. Stephens's collation was imperfectly printed, the interpolation might have been noted in the collation itself, though it was not printed in the margin of R. Stephens's Greek Testament: it may be replied, that Beza, who was in possession of the collation itself, and has quoted from it an hundred and twelve readings of Stephens's manuscripts, and, among the rest, six from the Codex β , which are not printed in Stephens's margin, (Wetsten. Prol. p. 145.) has quoted the interpolation in question from his own MS. yet takes not the least notice of its being in H. Stephens's collation of the Cod. β . And that he was not inattentive to Stephens's various readings, at that very place, appears from his quoting, in the very next verse, $\epsilon\kappa\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ from the Cod. Stephani ϵ . Another instance is Acts xv. 2. where the Codex Bezae has a very long and remarkable reading, consisting of not less than twenty-five words, which are found in no other manuscript, and which H. Stephens has not quoted from his Codex β . But he has quoted a reading of much less importance from the very same place: he could not therefore have overlooked these twenty-five words, if they had been in his manuscript. And that H. Stephens did not note them, appears not only from their being unnoticed in the margin of Stephens's edition, (though even this circumstance is sufficient to warrant the inference, where a reading of less importance is observed) but likewise, from the positive testimony of Beza, who was in possession of Henry Ste-

phens's autograph. For in his note to Acts xv. 2. in his edition of 1582, he quotes the twenty-five words in question from his own manuscript, and observes on them, 'Quod autem hic adjectum invenio in meo vetustissimo codice, etsi nolim temere in contextum admittere, *quum id nusquam alibi inveniam*, mire tamen hunc locum illustrat. From all these circumstances therefore, it seems reasonable to infer, that the Cod. Bezae, and the Cod. β, though very similar, are not the same; and that the manuscript, which Stephens collated in Italy, is at present either lost or buried in obscurity, in the same manner as the Codex Boreeli, the Codex Camerarii, the Codex Rhodienfis, Erasmus's MS. of the Revelation, and several other manuscripts of the Greek Testament, used by Stephens himself, and other editors, with many, if not most, of the manuscripts, from which the Editiones principes of the Classics were printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

To these arguments for the diversity of the MSS. it may be objected, 1. That Beza's positive evidence can go no further than to the place where, and the time when, the MS. was found; not to the number of years that the manuscript had been preserved there. Further, that as Beza has nowhere asserted that he himself discovered the manuscript in the monastery of St. Irenæus, and uses the expressions *Exemplar venerandæ vetustatis* ——— *reperitum*, (not *reperi*), and again, in his letter to the University of Cambridge, *Exemplar ex cœnobio Lugdunensi ante aliquot annos nactus*, it is possible that even his evidence in regard to the place where, and the time when it was found, was given only at second hand, and that he relied on the authority of some person, who stole it from the monastery during the civil commotions in Lyons, and brought it to him for sale. On the other hand, it must be observed that Beza's words do not necessarily imply that he did not find it himself. He was probably at Lyons in the very year, in which he says that his manuscript was discovered; for in that year he took a journey from Geneva to Paris, to be present at a council—

council between the Catholics and the Hugonots, as appears from the accounts of Freher, Moreri, and Bayle. If then he was guilty of a literary theft, and appropriated to his own use what belonged to the monks of St. Irenæus, a matter by no means improbable in itself, since critics, as well as connoisseurs, are sometimes unable to resist temptation, he would naturally have expressed himself in such a manner, as to leave it undetermined whether it had been stolen by himself, or another person.

2. That though Henry Stephens, who collated the Codex β , and must frequently have seen the Codex Bezaë, has no where asserted that they were one and the same manuscript, yet the argument drawn from his silence is only negative, and that arguments of this kind are not always conclusive. But it is more difficult to find an answer to the other part of this argument, namely, that Beza has constantly quoted the two manuscripts as distinct, which he hardly would have done, if Henry Stephens had ever observed, that they were one and the same. Wetstein however, who takes for granted that H. Stephens actually informed Beza, that they were one and the same manuscript, goes so far as to accuse Beza of a wilful intention to deceive. His words are, (Prol. p. 34.) Vereor tamen ut Beza ipse omni culpa careat, neque reperio quomodo ipsum crimine minus sincera fide administratæ rei liberare queam. Sine dubio enim scire potuit suum codicem prius a familiari suo Stephano adhibitum fuisse, et nihilominus ad utrumque sæpitis, tanquam diversi codices sint, provocat. Nor is Wetstein singular in his opinion of Beza's critical dishonesty: for Simon, in his Hist. crit. du texte du N. T. ch. xxx. p. 372. says, Ce n'est pas icy le lieu de donner d'autres preuves de la mauvaise foi de Beze dans ses Notes sur le Nouveau Testament. 3. That the four quotations from the Codex β , in the two places, where the Codex Bezaë has a chasm, may be explained, either on the supposition, that two leaves, which are now wanting, have been lost *since* Stephens's time; or as typographical errors, an explanation, which Wetstein says ought not to be re-

jected, where the weight of evidence is so much in favour of the other side; and in one of these examples in particular, Matth. xxvii. 3. it is highly probable that β is a mistake for π . See Wettstein's Prol. p. 37. compared with his various readings to this passage. The same likewise may be said of John xiii. 2. the example which I observed in the preceding paragraph. 4. That the argument drawn from the contradictions above-mentioned is inconclusive, because many instances may be produced of collations made by different persons from the very same manuscript, which contradict each other much more frequently, than the extracts from the Codex β contradict the readings of the Codex Bezae: and that, as errors are unavoidable, both in making extracts from a manuscript, and in printing those extracts from the collation, we should often draw a very unjust inference, if we argued from a few contradictions to the diversity of the manuscripts. 5. That the fifth argument is not absolutely decisive, since it is possible that H. Stephens might overlook the most remarkable readings, even in places, where we should least expect it, and likewise possible, if he had noted them, that the same remarkable readings might have been overlooked both by R. Stephens, and Beza.—What weight is due to the preceding arguments and objections, I leave to the determination of the reader.

Thus far I had written in the first edition, when I was doubtful whether the Codex Bezae was the same with the Codex β , or not: but a more minute examination of the subject has since convinced me that the arguments for their identity greatly outweigh the arguments for their diversity. I have compared the Complutentian edition with Stephens's quotations from it throughout the whole New Testament, and have found that among 578 readings, quoted by Stephens from this edition, not less than 48, that is one twelfth, are either not at all in these, or not so as Stephens has quoted them. And since it is much more probable that mistakes should be made in collating a manuscript than in collating a printed edition, our knowledge that one reading in twelve is falsely ascribed

ascribed by Stephens to the Complutensian edition, will certainly warrant us to conclude that at least an equal number of mistakes were made in regard to any given manuscript. Consequently one difference among twelve readings proves nothing, it being no more than what we may reasonably expect. Further I have found, that Stephens has frequently passed over whole chapters in the Compl. edition, and sometimes three or four chapters together. At other times he has noted trifling readings, and neglected to note important readings in the very same place. The *internal* evidence therefore for the diversity of the Codex β and the Codex Bezae is of no value: and as to any external evidence for their diversity, it may be easily done away, or, at any rate, cannot be put in competition with the *internal* evidence for their *identity*. To ascertain the weight of this evidence we need only apply the Theorem, which I introduced in my Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis. From this Theorem it appears that the probability of their identity is to the probability of their diversity, as a sum, exceeding a thousand of nonillions, to unity.

115. Our author has by some mistake assigned the date of 1595 to Beza's last edition, which was not printed before 1598. Instead of fourteen years therefore, as our author says, Beza had sent away his manuscript nearly seventeen years, and was three years older than our author makes him: a circumstance which gives additional strength to his argument, in respect to the two examples produced by Wetstein, from Beza's last edition.

116. If the Codex Bezae, and the Codex Stephani β , are one and the same manuscript, this conjecture saves Beza's credit, and is at the same time attended with fewer difficulties, than Wetstein's hypothesis, the parts of which are not only improbable, but contradictory to each other, as will appear from the following Note. That Beza did not confound his MS. of the Gospels and Acts, with the MS. of St. Paul's epistles, in saying that he received from Lyons that, which came from Clermont, and vice versâ, is probable, because he is perfectly
consistent

consistent in his accounts of them, and specifies them so distinctly that we can hardly suppose him to have been guilty of the mistake, with which Wetstein charges him. Another part of Wetstein's hypothesis, namely, that Beza confounded the paltry convent of Clermont in the diocese of Beauvais, with the city of Clermont in the province of Auvergne, is almost incredible, when we reflect that Beza was not only well acquainted with France, and was educated in Paris, but that he had an uncle who was Prior of a Convent in the very diocese of Beauvais, from which diocese, as he himself relates, he procured his manuscript of St. Paul's epistles. But Wetstein does not rest here, for in the Prolegomena to the second part of his N. T. p. 1. he conjectures that Beza was guilty of a third mistake in regard to these manuscripts, and thinks that neither of them came from the monastery of St. Irenæus in Lyons, but that one of them came from the monastery of Cluny: for which opinion he has no other foundation, than that the monastery of Cluny was plundered in the civil war by the Swiss soldiers. Now where we have positive evidence on one side, and mere conjecture on the other, there surely can be no doubt, to which party the preference is due. Our author abides by the testimony of Beza, with respect to the place where, and the time when, the manuscript was found; but, as he accedes to the common hypothesis, that the Codex Bezae and the Codex Stephani β are one and the same manuscript, he is reduced to the necessity of supposing, that the manuscript which Henry Stephens collated in Italy not long before the year 1550, was afterwards deposited in the monastery of St. Irenæus, and there discovered again in 1562. Yet Beza declares that it had lain there time immemorial, and uses even the expression 'ut ipsius pene Irenæi temporibus extitisse videri possit,' &c. The question therefore to be examined is, what authority is due to this declaration of Beza? Now the manuscript must have been procured either by purchase, by present, or by theft. If procured either by purchase, or by present, the person who procured it, whe-

ther

ther Beza himself, or any other person, who gave or sold it to Beza, would probably have conversed on the subject with some of the monks of the convent, who would not have declared, that it had lain there time immemorial, if they had recollected the time of its arrival; and if it had been brought thither, only ten or twelve years before, it may seem improbable that this circumstance should have been unknown to them. But on the other hand, when we consider that monks in general are less attached to learning, than to luxury, and that Greek manuscripts are commodities, in which the monks of St. Irenæus never dealt, it is by no means impossible that they were ignorant, not only of the time when it was brought, but even that such a manuscript existed among them. And this conjecture is the more credible, when we reflect, that the very same thing may easily happen, not only in a convent of unlettered monks, but in societies which make literature their profession. The manuscripts, and I may add, valuable manuscripts of the late Mr. Jackson of Leicester, were deposited a very few years ago in the library of Jesus College in Cambridge: yet I would not undertake to affirm that every member of that learned society either knew the contents of these manuscripts, or recollected the time of their arrival. The declaration therefore of Beza, that the manuscript in question had lain time immemorial in the monastery of St. Irenæus, rests on very unstable ground, even on the supposition that it was procured by purchase, or present; but if it was stolen, as it very probably was, no questions could have been asked about it, and Beza's declaration is mere conjecture. Our author's hypothesis therefore involves no contradiction, like that of Wetstein.

But perhaps the following hypothesis will reconcile the difficulties attending the history of this manuscript, better than any other; namely, that the convent of Irenæus at Lyons was the place where Henry Stephens collated the manuscript. As Lyons is situated on the high road between Paris and Turin, H. Stephens might collate the manuscript there, on his journey either to or from Italy;

on

on his return to Paris he might deliver them to his father, R. Stephens, with other papers and extracts made in Italy; and of these extracts in general, whether made *in* Italy, or on the journey thither, Robert Stephens, who was not very exact about the places where MSS. were kept, might say that they were made in Italy. But if H. Stephens really collated the MS. at Lyons, all difficulties in regard to its history vanish at once.

117. Wetstein in his Prolegomena, p. 28. conjectures that the Codex Bezae was either preserved during some time at Trent, or that Henry Stephens, after having collated it in Italy, delivered it to the Bishop of Clermont at the time when the celebrated council was held there, which was in 1546, and that the Bishop brought it from the council to his diocese of Clermont in Auvergne. See Wetstein's Prol. p. 30. Now these two parts of Wetstein's hypothesis directly contradict each other: for it appears from Maittaire *Historia Stephanorum*, p. 204—207. that Henry Stephens did not go to Italy till after the death of Francis I, which happened in 1547. He could not therefore deliver it to the Bishop of Clermont at Trent in 1546, and if the bishop was in possession of the Codex Bezae, and brought it home with him, which we must suppose if it was discovered at Clermont in Auvergne in 1562, it cannot possibly have been the manuscript, which Henry Stephens collated in Italy between the years 1547 and 1550. See Note xxxvii. to Chap. 12. sect. 1.

PAGE 240.

118. Wetstein grounds this relation on the authority of Marianus Victorius in his notes on Jerom. Wetstein does not mention the place, but it is p. 570. of the edition of Jerom, printed at Antwerp in 1578. The words of Marianus Victorius are 'Hieronymus legit, sicut habet antiquissimus quidam Græcus Codex, quem Tridentum attulit Claromontanensis Episcopus anno Domino 1546, *εαν αυτον θελω μενειν στως, εως ερχομαι.*

119. Especially, when the difference of both manuscripts from the common text consists only in a single particle.

particle. Much stronger evidence is requisite to prove the identity, than the diversity of manuscripts. If the Bishop of Clermont had said that *οὕτως* had been wanting in his manuscript, we might have justly inferred, that it was a different manuscript from the Codex Bezaë, which has *οὕτως*. But if we take the converse of the proposition, and argue from the presence of *οὕτως* in both to the identity of the MSS. we rest on very unstable ground.

120. The words of Druthmar are ‘Vidi librum Evangelii Græce scriptum, qui dicebatur Sancti Hilarii fuisse, in quo primo erant Matthæus et Johannes, et post alii duo. Interrogavi enim Euphemium monachum cur hoc ita esset? &c. It appears then that Druthmar expressed his surprise at finding the Latin arrangement of the Gospels in a Greek manuscript; instead therefore of supposing that there existed many of that kind in the ninth century, we must conclude it to have been the first, which Druthmar had ever seen. Nor is any objection to be drawn from his silence, as to the Acts, and the Latin translation, for it does not appear to have been Druthmar’s intention to give a complete description of the manuscript: his whole attention seems to have been engaged by that circumstance, which appeared to him so very extraordinary, namely the Latin arrangement in a Greek manuscript. There is another circumstance which, though it does not in itself prove the identity of the manuscripts, may be admitted at least as collateral evidence. The Codex Bezaë is the only Greek manuscript at present known, which omits the words *εκπορευομεν δια σωματος*, Matth. iv. 4. and these very words are omitted by Druthmar, in quoting the same verse. See the sixth chapter of his *Expositio in Matthæum*, printed in the second volume, p. 291. of the *Nova bibliotheca veterum Patrum*. Parisiis, 1639. 2 tom. fol. The text of the Vulgate in this passage is, Non in solo pane vivit homo, sed in omni verbo, *quod procedit de ore Dei*. But Druthmar’s quotation is like the text of the Codex Bezaë, Non in solo pane vivit homo, sed in omni verbo Dei. And in his commentary on this verse he repeats ‘verbo Dei’
not

not less than four times, but takes not the least notice of any words like *εκπορευομεν δια σωματος*, as being between them, though he explains in general every word. This example I discovered by accident: it is probable therefore, that if all Druthmar's quotations were collated, more examples of coincidence might be found between them, and the *lectiones singulares* of the Codex Bezae.

121. As our author himself rejects the argument, it is unnecessary to quote it from the Orient. Bibl.

PAGE 241.

122. Here Dr. Ridley was certainly mistaken, for Professor Adler has very accurately collated the marginal readings of the Philoxenian version of the four Gospels, and in these alone has found not less than nineteen readings, which exist in no other MS. at present known than the Codex Bezae. See Adler's *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 130. and Note 97. to this section, where the nineteen examples are enumerated. Among them is the celebrated addition after Matth. xx. 28. *υμεις δε ζητειτε, κ. τ. λ.* which is noted in the margin of the Philoxenian version, in the Codex Aſſemanianus 1, collated by Adler (but not in Dr. Ridley's MS.) with a Syriac note made by the editor Thomas, of which the following is a translation, *Hæc quidem in exemplis antiquis in Luca tantum leguntur, capite LIII. Inveniuntur autem in exemplis Græcis hoc loco: quapropter hic etiam a nobis adjecta sunt.* See Adler's *Vers. Syr.* p. 90. It must likewise be remarked that Adler's collation was confined to the four Gospels. In the Acts of the Apostles I have observed a great number of examples: for instance, Acts vi. 11. the Codex Bezae has a passage consisting of fourteen words contained in no other manuscript at present known, and this very passage Wetstein found in the margin of Ridley's manuscript of the Philoxenian version. See also Acts xiv. 4, 10. xv. 7. which are examples of the same kind. If therefore we argue from this coincidence alone, we shall conclude, that the Codex Bezae was collated at Alexandria by Thomas of Harkel in the seventh century, with
the

the same propriety as Wetstein infers from a similar coincidence, that it was collated in Italy by H. Stephens in the sixteenth century. But here again we have examples of disagreement, as well as in the former case. The reading of the Codex Bezaë, Luke xx. 34. is *γεννῶνται καὶ γεννώσιν*, 'gignuntur et gignunt,' in which it differs from all other Greek manuscripts at present known, which universally express the sense of 'uxores ducunt, et nuptum dantur,' though not precisely in the same Greek words. Now there is a Syriac note to this reading, in the margin of the Philoxenian version (see p. 400. of White's edition) of which the following is a translation. In exemplari antiquo est 'gignunt et gignuntur,' sed in Græco non est. Since therefore Thomas expressly declares, that a reading, which we know to be in the Codex Bezaë, was not in any of his Greek manuscripts, we must necessarily conclude that it was not in the number of those which he collated: unless we say that Thomas was here guilty of an oversight, as Wetstein says of Stephens, where the Codex Bezaë differs from the Codex Stephani β.

Two questions still remain to be examined, the one relative to the place where, the other to the time when, the Codex Bezaë was written. Simon, Mill, Wetstein, our author, and most other critics contend that it was written in the West of Europe, where Latin was better understood than Greek, since a translation would have been wholly superfluous, if the manuscript had been written, where the original language of the Greek Testament was the language of the country. The three first of the above-mentioned critics go so far as to assert that it was certainly written, not by a Greek, but by a Latin scribe; which, they say, appears partly from the formation of the letters, partly from the orthography, observable in many of the Greek words. See Simon Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T. Ch. 30. p. 360. Dissertation critique sur les MSS. du N. T. p. 25—33. Mill's Prolegomena, sect. 1271. and Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 30. But the arguments which have been brought by Simon and repeated

peated by Mill, to shew that the Codex Bezaë was written by a Latin scribe, either prove nothing, or prove the very reverse. One of his arguments is the following, p. 360. ‘Le Grec et le Latin sont écrits d’une même main, et le Grec approche plus des anciennes lettres uncialles des Latins, que de celles des Grecs. Les premières sont plus quarrées, au lieu que les grandes lettres des Grecs sont plus longues et plus maigres.’ Here Simon seems to have been ignorant, that the long and narrow shape of the Greek uncial letters was not introduced before the eighth century, (Montfaucon Palæographia, p. 230) and that the square form, which is observable in the Codex Bezaë, is found in the most ancient Greek inscriptions. This argument therefore proves nothing. Another observation, which he makes in the same page, leads rather to an opposite conclusion. ‘Le Grec et le Latin sont écrits d’une même main, et d’une lettre tout à fait semblable; enforte qu’il y a même quelque fois des lettres purement Grecques dans le Latin.’ From this last circumstance one might rather conclude that the Codex Bezaë was written by a man, who was more accustomed to write Greek than Latin, and it appears so on examining the manuscript itself. I would rather accede therefore to the opinion of Griesbach, who says in his Symbolæ, p. lvii. ‘Character græcus satis elegans non prodit scribam latinum; imo elegantiores fere sunt græcarum quam latinarum literarum ductus.’ And again, p. lxii. ‘Codex a græco librario exaratus, &c.’ But the Codex Bezaë might still have been written in Italy, or in some other part of the West of Europe where Latin was spoken, since it is highly probable that Greek scribes were employed in Italy for copying Greek books. This opinion is supported not only by Simon, Mill, Wetstein, our author, and most other critics, but is likewise defended by Montfaucon, who is one of the best judges of antiquity that ever existed. It is true that he does not expressly treat of the Codex Bezaë, but what he says of the Codex Claromontanus (Palæographia, p. 217) is applicable to the former; for they so nearly resemble each

each other, as to have been taken, though erroneously, for parts of the same whole. Now the Codex Claromontanus appears to have been written in a country, that was under the authority of the church of Rome; for the epistle to the Hebrews is written at the end, and (as I have been informed by a friend, who has lately examined it) even by a later hand. See Simon Hist. crit. du Texte du N. T. p. 362. And as the epistle to the Hebrews was always admitted by the Greek church, but was rejected by the church of Rome during some time, and when admitted was placed at the end of St. Paul's Epistles, not before the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, as in the Codex Alexandrinus, and other manuscripts written under the authority of the Greek church, Simon and Montfaucon concluded, as well from this circumstance, as from the Latin translation, that the Codex Claromontanus was written in the West of Europe. If we argue therefore by analogy, we shall conclude the same of the Codex Bezae: at least we may infer that it *might* have been written in the West of Europe, as it so nearly resembles a manuscript that was so. If it be objected, that the Latin letters both in the Codex Claromontanus, and Codex Bezae, are very different from those observable in the Augiensis, and Boernerianus, manuscripts confessedly written in the West of Europe, we may reply, that these are much less ancient than the two former, and admit therefore of no comparison; the former having the Latin text in uncial letters, the latter in a current hand. That Latin characters nearly of the same form as those of the Codex Bezae and Codex Claromontanus, were used before the seventh century by Latin transcribers themselves, is evident from the specimens which have been given by Mabillon and Blanchini. No man will suppose that purely Latin manuscripts, without the addition of a Greek text, were ever written in Greece: yet Mabillon and Blanchini have produced many specimens of ancient Latin MSS. in uncial letters, which resemble those of the Codex Bezae. See Mabillon de re diplomatica. p. 355. 257. Blanchini Evangeliarium Qua-

druplex, P. I. p. 532. plate 2d. and 4th. P. II. p. 588. plate 2d. and page 600. plate 1st, 2d. and 7th. See also Astle's Origin and Progress of Writing, p. 82. There is no presumption therefore whatsoever a priori against the opinion that the Codex Bezae was written in the West of Europe; and when we take into consideration the two following circumstances, it will appear highly probable that it actually was so. 1. The Latin translation was added with no other view, than as a mean of making the original intelligible to those, who were not skilled in the Greek; and it was not added merely in consequence of the high authority of the church, which used it. For in that case the transcriber would have adopted some established text, from which he would have never deviated, whereas the Latin text of the Codex Bezae is found in no Latin manuscript, either ancient or modern. It has omissions, inversions, and interpolations, in which it agrees with the Greek text to which it is added, but in which it differs from all other manuscripts, whether Greek or Latin. Now this translation would have been wholly superfluous, if the manuscript had been written for the use of a Greek, to whom a Latin translation was unnecessary, and still more so, if written in Egypt, as Father Georgi (Fragm. Græco-Copto-Thebaicum, p. 199.) supposes, where Latin was unknown. 2. The Gospels in the Codex Bezae are written in the following order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. This arrangement was never admitted by the Greek church, or in any country subject to its authority, but was the common arrangement of the ancient Latin manuscripts, as appears from the Evangelium Quadruplex. From all these circumstances it seems reasonable to conclude that the Codex Bezae was written in the West of Europe, in a country where Latin was better understood than Greek, and which was subject to the authority of the church of Rome. It is true that the word *ANAGNΩΣΜΑ*, which is very frequently written in the margin of the Greek text, and in uncial letters, shews that it was used in an early age as a *Lecionarium* in some Greek church. But this circumstance

proves

proves nothing, because the *αναγνώσματα* were not written by the original copyist, but added by a different hand, as Griesbach has rightly observed in his *Symbolæ*, p. lvii. A manuscript written in one country may be easily transported into another; the *Codex Alexandrinus*, in the compass of a few years, was in Alexandria, Constantinople and London; and that the *Codex Bezaë* has been subject to several migrations is not improbable from the various corrections both in the Greek and in the Latin texts. Griesbach in his *Symbolæ*, p. lxii. says, *Codex a Græco librario exaratus e græcorum manibus sæpius in latinorum manus pervenit, et vicissim aliquoties ad Græcos rediit, aut possessores saltem habuit plures utriusque linguæ gnaros.*

Another hypothesis may be proposed, which will solve the several phenomena relative to the *Codex Bezaë*, as easily, or perhaps more so than the preceding: namely, that it was written either at Constantinople, or in some city of the Greek empire in Europe, for the use of some person or community belonging to the Latin church, between the time of Constantine, and the final separation of the Greek and Latin churches. During this period, it is probable that many Latin families removed from Italy, and settled in some of the principal cities of Greece; and perhaps whole communities attached to the Latin Church existed in Constantinople, for a considerable time after the removal of the seat of Empire. Now the *Codex Bezaë* is exactly such a manuscript as we may suppose to have been written for the use either of a Latin community, or some person of distinction, settled in a city of the Greek empire. In a MS. of this kind we should naturally expect the hand writing of a Greek scribe, that a Latin translation would be added to the Greek text, and that the Latin order would be observed in the arrangement of the four Gospels: all which we find in the *Codex Bezaë*. The same hypothesis likewise accounts for the addition of the *αναγνώσματα*, the additions and corrections, which have been made by different hands, both in the Greek and Latin texts, and the various marginal annotations, many of

which are in barbarous Greek, and in a modern hand, without having recourse to the additional supposition that the manuscript has travelled backwards and forwards from the West to the East of Europe, in order to account for the several phenomena observable in this MS. It was brought perhaps toward the close of the Greek empire from Greece into Italy, where it was collated by Henry Stephens, if it is the same as the Codex Stephani β, before it came into the hands of Theodore Beza. I am aware that an objection may be made to the preceding hypothesis, drawn from the text itself of the Codex Bezae. It may be said, that if the Codex Bezae had been written in Greece, we should probably have found in it the readings of the Greek edition, or what Semler and Griesbach call the *Recensio Constantinopolitana*; whereas it is known that the Codex Bezae contains readings of a very different kind. But independently of the circumstance that all the manuscripts of what is called the Greek or Byzantine edition, are much more modern than the Codex Bezae, we must not forget that a manuscript written in one country may be copied from a manuscript that was written in another: and if we argue from the readings of the Codex Bezae to the place, where it was written, we may conclude that it was written either in Syria, or in Egypt: for in many instances, where it departs from all other Greek manuscripts, it agrees with the old Syriac, the marginal readings of the new Syriac, the Coptic version, and the quotations of Origen. We need therefore make only one addition to the last-mentioned hypothesis, an addition which agrees with the opinion of Dr. Semler, and we shall solve every phenomenon relative to the manuscript in question: namely, that the writer of the Codex Bezae used several Greek manuscripts, from which he selected those readings which appeared to him to be the best, and that one of those manuscripts was of the Alexandrine edition.

The antiquity of the Codex Bezae is a matter as difficult to determine, with any precision, as the foregoing question. If we argue from the internal evidence of the
text,

text, and conclude from the antiquity of its readings, that is, from the circumstance that the Codex Bezae is free from many spurious additions and alterations, that were introduced into the more modern Greek manuscripts, (though it has others of a different kind not found in modern manuscripts,) the inference to be deduced is, not that the manuscript itself is ancient, but only that it has a very ancient text, a matter, which is of much greater importance than the antiquity of the vellum, and of the ink. See the latter part of Note 11. That it was written before the eighth century is certain, as appears from the shape of the letters, the want of intervals between the words, and of accents, and marks of aspiration. For in the eighth century the Greek uncial characters degenerated from the square and round form, which is seen in the Codex Bezae, to an oblong shape; marks of aspiration and accents were added, and the elegance of writing considerably decreased. See Montfaucon *Palaographia Graeca*, Lib. III. cap. vi. Secondly, it appears from comparing the letters of the Codex Bezae with the Greek inscriptions given by Montfaucon, p. 158—175. not only that it *must* be more ancient than the eighth century, but that it *may* be as ancient as the sixth, the fifth, or even the fourth century. No inscription however comes so near to it in the shape of its characters, as that which Montfaucon has given, p. 174. N°. 1. an inscription which was engraved about the middle of the sixth century, in the reign of Justinian. The letters of this inscription and of the Codex Bezae are very nearly alike, both in form and proportion, and the only material difference is in the Alpha, which in the former is made thus A, in the latter thus Λ . But this is no argument against the antiquity of the manuscript, for though the former shape is the most ancient, yet the latter was introduced in a very early age into manuscripts, because it might be made with only two strokes of the pen, while the latter, which required three strokes of the pen, and was therefore rejected from manuscripts, was retained in

inscriptions, because it was more easy to be cut by the chissel. See the *Palæographia Græca*, p. 152. Nor is there any great dissimilarity between the letters of the Codex Bezae, and an inscription given by Montfaucon, p. 170. which bears indeed no date, but which Montfaucon, p. 168. says may certainly be referred ‘ad Augustorum priora sæcula.’ It appears therefore, from comparing the Codex Bezae with Greek inscriptions of different ages, that it cannot have been written later than the sixth century, and that it may have been written even two or three centuries earlier. We must in the next place therefore examine, whether this possibility may be made to amount to a probability. The tawny colour of the ink discovers indeed the highest antiquity; but, if two manuscripts were written with the same ink, the one in the fourth, the other in the sixth century, they would probably be faded at present in a nearly equal degree, and the difference between twelve and fourteen hundred years would hardly be sufficient to enable us to discover at present any difference in the colour. Besides, as some inks are more durable than others, the letters of a modern manuscript may be more faded than those of a more ancient manuscript. But a probable argument may be derived from the chapters and sections, into which the ancient manuscripts of the Greek Testament were usually divided. This argument I do not mean to produce as a new one, for it has been applied by Grabe, Casley, and Woide, to the Codex Alexandrinus, and by Hichel to the Codex Vaticanus. It is well known to those who are conversant in manuscripts of the Greek Testament, that the four Gospels are divided into greater and smaller portions, the one called *τιτλος*, the other *κεφαλαιον*, in the same manner, though in different proportions, as we divide them into chapters and verses. The *τιτλοι*, or the larger portions, were generally marked in the upper margin; the *κεφαλαια*, or, as they are frequently called, the Ammonian sections, were always marked at the side, and to these sections Eusebius adapted his ten tables, or harmony of the Gospels, to which

which he referred by writing, under each of the Greek letters or numbers expressive of the Ammonian sections, letters which denoted that table, where the section was to be sought. Those who have not access to Greek manuscripts, will find this very clearly represented, either in Stephens's edition of 1550, or in Küster's edition of Mill's Greek Testament. The Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, were likewise divided into sections, which are called from the inventor the sections of Euthalius; and they were noted in the margin by letters, in the same manner as the Ammonian sections in the Gospels. Now as the Euthalian sections are not marked in the margin of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, in the Codex Alexandrinus, though the *τιτλοι* and *κεφαλαια* are noted in the Gospels, Grabe in his Prolegomena to the Septuagint, Casley in his Catalogue of the King's manuscripts, and Woide in his Preface to the Codex Alexandrinus, contend that the Codex Alexandrinus was written before Euthalius had introduced those sections, that is before the year 396. But this is much too hasty a conclusion, since a considerable time might have elapsed after the year 396, before those sections were brought into general use. Besides, though no sections are marked in the margin of the Codex Alexandrinus, in the Acts and the Epistles, yet the text itself is very distinctly divided into sections, by blank spaces at the end of each section, and by large letters written in the margin at the beginning of each section. These sections amount in the Codex Alex. in the Acts of the Apostles to 427, as may be seen on counting them in Woide's edition. It appears from the list of *κεφαλαια*, prefixed to the Acts of the Apostles, in Stephens's edition of 1550, and Küster's edition of Mill, that the common Greek chapters, or Euthalian sections, amounted only to 40 in the Acts of the Apostles. Now the division into smaller portions, was probably later than the division into larger portions; and the portions into which the Acts of the Apostles are divided in the Codex Alexandrinus, appears to be nothing more than a subdivision of the Euthalian sections, for I have compared

them in nearly one half of the book, and found in every instance, that, where an Euthalian section begins, a new section begins in the Codex Alexandrinus, except in one instance, which is of little importance, namely, Acts viii. 20. where an Euthalian section ends, whereas the corresponding section in the Codex Alex. ends with the next verse. Upon the whole, however, the writer of the Codex Alex. appears to have been acquainted with the Euthalian division, and Woide's argument is inconclusive.

If we apply the same argument to the Codex Bezae, we shall meet with the same objection. For though no sections are noted in the margin, yet the text itself is divided into sections, which are denoted, not by blank spaces, as in the Codex Alexandrinus, but by the first word of each section being so written, that the first letter stands in the margin, which is sometimes greater, but in general of the same size with the other letters. Now these sections are not the same as those in the Codex Alexandrinus, but the number of them is nearly the same in both manuscripts; and, as I have found on examining the Codex Bezae, that wherever an Euthalian section commences, a new section begins in the Codex Bezae, it appears that the sections of these two manuscripts in the Acts of the Apostles, are only different subdivisions of the Euthalian sections. This argument therefore, instead of being favourable to the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Codex Bezae, is rather an argument that neither of them were written before the fifth century.

Another argument, which I will consider independently of the former, may be deduced from the divisions in the four Gospels. The *τιτλοι* of Eusebius are wholly unnoticed in the margin of the Codex Bezae, and the *κεφαλαια*, or Ammonian sections, are not accompanied with the references to the canons of Eusebius. This is observed by Mill, in his Prolegomena, § 1271. who supposes that these references were omitted through forgetfulness, which cannot have been the reason, because the sections are sometimes written so close together, as to leave no room for a reference between them. I have

have thought it extraordinary that he did not rather deduce this very obvious inference from the omission of these references to the canons of Eusebius, that the Codex Bezae was written, not indeed before the time of Eusebius, but before the tables which he invented were brought into general use; and as Eusebius was a man of so distinguished a character, and we know that Jerom himself adopted these canons, (Hieronym. Præf. in iv Evang. ad Damasum) we might suppose that they were adopted in general within an hundred years after their invention. This argument therefore, if no objection could be made to it, would prove that the Codex Bezae could not have been written later than the middle of the fifth century. But I have since discovered the reason why Mill did not apply this argument, for he relates, § 666. that he had seen several other manuscripts of the Gospels, beside the Codex Bezae, which have the Ammonian sections without the references to the canons of Eusebius. He has not mentioned any one in particular, but I have seen two in the University Library at Cambridge, marked Dd. 9. 69. and Mm. 6. 9. the former of which is the Codex Mori 1. a MS. in Trinity College Library, marked B, 10, 6. and the Cod. Gonvilli et Caii, all written in the common small Greek character, and at least six hundred years after the time of Eusebius, in which the Ammonian sections are written in the margin, without any reference to the canons of Eusebius. Their absence therefore from the Codex Bezae affords no absolute proof of its antiquity.

But there is another circumstance to be taken into the account, relative to the Ammonian sections in the Codex Bezae, namely, that they were noted in the margin by a different, and of course later hand, than that which wrote the manuscript itself. This is asserted by Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach, who have all examined the manuscript. See Mill's Prolegomena, § 666, 1271. Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 31. and Griesbach's Symbolæ criticae, p. lviii. And that their assertion is founded on the truth, appears from an examination of the manuscript

script itself. For though the Ammonian sections are noted in the margin with the same uncial letters, as are used in the text, and the ink is in both places of the same tawny colour, yet the letters in the margin are somewhat smaller than those in the text, and some of the former, when closely examined, manifestly differ from those in the latter, especially the *επισημον*, that denotes the number six, which in the margin has always the following mark *Σ*, but in the text is written thus *Ϛ*, which is probably the most ancient mark, it being compounded of *Γ* and *Λ*, the one an erect, the other an inverted gamma, as *Χ* is compounded of *Υ* and *Λ*: an instance of this kind is Mark xv. 33. where it may be observed that Wetstein has copied erroneously, and written *Γ* instead of *Ϛ*, by which means he has converted *εχλς* into *τρελς*, a reading found in no MS. whatsoever, and ‘sexta’ is written in the Latin at full length. It is likewise certain that the writer of the Cod. Bezaë did not intend that the text should be divided into the Ammonian sections, for he has actually divided it into sections of a totally different kind. They are denoted by the first word of each section projecting into the margin, so that the first letter stands out of the text, but is contiguous to the second letter, and is generally of the same size with the rest, though it is sometimes larger. These sections amount in the Gospel of St. Mark to 153, as I have found after counting them twice, whereas the Ammonian sections in that Gospel amount to 236, which is nearly double the number. It is true that the sections formed by the text, correspond sometimes to those noted in the margin, that is the Ammonian sections, but they much more frequently do not, so that their coincidence in certain cases clearly arises from no other circumstance, than that both are divisions of the text according to the sense, and being very numerous, must of course sometimes coincide. Another proof, that the writer of the Codex Bezaë did not intend to mark the Ammonian sections, is, that an Ammonian section frequently begins in the middle of the line, whereas those which I have mentioned

mentioned above commence always at the beginning of the line. And though the person who added the Ammonian sections, has constantly added two dots (:) before the word which begins the section, yet the interval is frequently so small between it and the preceding word, that he was obliged to add them nearly at the top of the letter. For instance, in St. John's Gospel, the Ammonian section AA begins with the words, **ΘΗΚΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΥΙΟΝ**, John iii. 36. but the letter O is so near to the last letter of the preceding word, that it was necessary to add the two dots at the top of the line, in a manner which I cannot represent by types.

From all these circumstances it is certain, that the writer of the Codex Bezae neither did note, nor intend to note, the Ammonian sections: nor are they accurately noted even by the person, who afterwards added them, for they frequently disagree in position with the Codex Alexandrinus, which we must conclude in this case to be accurate, because they are not only marked in the margin, but determined by blank spaces in the text itself. Now the question to be examined is, what argument can be deduced from the above-mentioned omission, in respect to the antiquity of the manuscript in question? If we conclude that it was written before the invention of the Ammonian sections, we shall refer it to the beginning of the third, or the end of the second century: a conclusion, which would be rather too hasty, because a considerable time might have elapsed before their use was become general. But since these divisions were adopted and recommended by Eusebius in the fourth century, and likewise by Jerom at the end of the same, and beginning of the following century, they must have been universally known before the close of the fifth. And though it may be said, that the writer of the Codex Bezae must have copied from some more ancient manuscript, and might transcribe therefore the old, long after the new divisions were introduced, we may reply, that as the Codex Bezae is written in a splendid and expensive manner, it is probable that the person or persons for whom it was written, would have chosen that

that such chapters or sections should be observed in it, as were in general use, at the time when it was written. If we argue therefore from the omission of the Ammonian sections, we may fairly conclude, that the Codex Bezae is at least as ancient as the fifth century. But as the writer of this manuscript has adopted sections in the Acts of the Apostles, which imply the previous existence of the Euthalian sections, I would not ascribe to it a greater antiquity.

With respect to the comparative antiquity of the Cod. Bezae with that of other manuscripts, we may safely assert, that no one can be put in competition with it, except the Codex Vaticanus. The most ancient Greek manuscripts, (I mean those only which are quoted by Wetstein) beside these two, have, according to Wetstein, (Prol. p. 6.) the usual *τιτλοι* and *κεφαλαια*. We may suppose therefore that those, which have more ancient divisions, and have other marks which denote the greatest antiquity, are in this respect entitled to the highest rank. If it be asked, to which of these the precedence is due, I would answer, to the Codex Bezae, for the Codex Vaticanus has accents, and marks of aspiration, which were added by the person, who wrote the manuscript itself. See Birch Prolegomena, p. 14.

PAGE 241.

123. That Mill's extracts are frequently defective, and sometimes erroneous, appears from a new collation that was made about the year 1733, by Mr. Dickenson of St. John's College. This collation is at present in the library of Jesus College, where it is marked O, Θ, 2. In Wetstein's extracts likewise are many errors, as appears from comparing them with the manuscript itself. In fact there is a two-fold source of error in Wetstein's extracts from this manuscript, for as he took a copy of it, he probably collated, not the original while he was in Cambridge, but his copy after his return.

124. The copy which Wetstein took of the Codex Cantabrigiensis is not the only transcript, which has been made

made of this manuscript, for Simon, in the last page of his Preface to the *Histoire critique du Texte du N. T.* relates, that he himself had a copy which had been sent him from Cambridge. There is also a third copy, which is preserved in the library of Trinity College in Cambridge, and marked B. 10, 3. in the cabinet of MSS. marked B. It is written on vellum, in small characters, with accents and marks of aspiration. It is a very large quarto, containing only the Greek text. On the first page is the following inscription, *Novum Testamentum Græcum exscriptum ex antiquissimo MS. ad academiam a Cel. Beza misso. Ad. v. 13. c. 22. Actorum Apostolorum hoc exemplar transcriptum est.* This transcript must have been made some time in the seventeenth century, for it is not noted in James's *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis*, published in the year 1600, but it is quoted in the Catalogue of the manuscripts in Trinity Library, published in the Catalog. *MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ, Londini 1697, Tom. I. P. III. p. 94. N°. 193.* It is also mentioned by Le Long, in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 174.

CODICES CANTABRIGIENSES ALII.

PAGE 242.

125. Mill, after having enumerated the Acts of the Apostles, and the seven catholic epistles, adds, *claudit reliquas epistola ad Hebræos*, where ‘*reliquas*’ can refer only to epistles not enumerated, that is, the epistles of St. Paul. And it certainly does contain the other epistles of St. Paul, as I have found on examination. A more accurate collation of this manuscript was made some years ago for Jackson, as appears from the following passage in the *Memoirs and Life of Jackson*, p. 265. *Mecum communicavit Jo. Wigley socius Collegii Christi apud Cantabrigienfes collationem pervetusti MSti in collegio dicto quem Millius vocat Cant. 2. in qua collatione sunt plus quam quingentiæ variae lectiones*

tiones non notatæ a Millio, et aliquæ quas non recte descripsit ipse. Hic MS. congruit maxime cum Complutensi et Leicestrensi. This collation was bequeathed by Jackson to Jesus College in Cambridge, where it is preserved at present in a bundle, which contains many other writings left by Jackson. It is not numbered, but is placed on the same shelf as Jackson's bound manuscripts.

126. Our author having accused Mill of inaccuracy in the description of this manuscript, extends the accusation to Wetstein also, but in both cases with equal injustice. It is really extraordinary that any one should discover a difficulty in Wetstein's description. That *Oxonienfis* is an error of the press for *Cantabrigienfis*, is evident from Wetstein's reference to it, Vol. II. p. 452. in describing the *Codex Collegii Christi Cantabrigienfis*; the error which had been committed in the *Prolegomena* to the second part, is really corrected in the catalogue of MSS. prefixed to them, at the beginning of the second volume, where *Oxonienfis* is altered to *Cantabrigienfis*, and, what is still more, is particularly noted in the list of *Errata*, Vol. II. p. 920. The mistake of 28 for 29, though it corrects itself, is likewise noted among the *Errata*. One mistake however is made by Wetstein: he describes it as an octavo, whereas it is a large quarto. There is likewise in Christ's College library an *Evangelistarium* not noted by Wetstein. It is written on vellum, in small characters exactly like those of the preceding manuscript, and in folio. At the beginning is written in a modern hand, *Evangelia cum Deo singulis diebus lecta, incipientia primo die Dominico*.

E dono Francisci Tayleri, Julii 24, 1654.

PAGE 243.

127. Our author, in describing the chasms of this manuscript, has copied from Mill's *Prol.* § 1375. whose account is more accurate than that of Wetstein, Vol. II. p. 13.

128. In

128. In the London Polyglot this MS. is noted Cod. Em, in Mill's Gr. Test. Cod. Cant. 3. It may be observed, that the description given in the London Polyglot of the MS. belonging to Emmanuel College is incomplete, for we there find, Cod. Em. Epistolæ S. Pauli Græce, but it certainly has the catholic epistles also, which are placed before those of St. Paul, and have those very chasms described by Mill in his Prolegomena, § 1375. This manuscript has been deprived therefore of the power of being produced as an evidence in the controversy relative to 1 John v. 7. It is at present marked in Emanuel library 1, 2, 33. Lastly, the extracts printed in the Polyglot were not copied only, but likewise augmented by Mill, for speaking of this MS. he uses the expression, 'sedulo perlustrare contigit.' In the Index to his Prolegomena, he takes notice of another Codex Em. but this is a totally different manuscript, and will be described in the sequel. See Note 326.

129. And also in this manuscript, without any intervention of the Syriac, to which there is no necessity of appealing, to explain the omission of the conjunction *καί*, which was probably occasioned by no other circumstance, than the carelessness of the transcriber.

130. The chasms of this MS. our author has inaccurately copied from Wettstein, for he has omitted to mention a part of the first, and the whole of the second chapter of the epistle to Titus.

131. This manuscript is undoubtedly the same as that, which Mill understands by Cod. Luc. for the name, John Luke, is written at the beginning. It is at present noted in the University Library Dd, XI. 90. That the manuscript thus noted is really the manuscript in question, appears from the coincidence of its contents, and its chasms, with Wettstein's description.

132. This manuscript is now marked in the University Library Ff. 1. 30. Two other Cambridge manuscripts are quoted by Mill and Wettstein, which our author does not describe here, because Mill has not quoted them by the abbreviation Cant. See N°. 134, 244.

The

The two Codices Mori are likewise preserved at present in the University Library : also several manuscripts of the Greek Testament, which have never been collated ; but not one of these is written in uncial letters. There are two MS. which more particularly deserve notice ; the one marked Kk. 6. 4. the other Mm. 6. 9. The former contains the Acts of the Apostles, and all the Epistles, and once belonged to Vatablus, whose name is written at the beginning. It was collated and quoted by R. Stephens, under the title Codex 17. The other contains the whole N. T. except the Revelation.

CODEx CLAROMONTANUS.

PAGE 244.

133. The Bibliotheca Puteana derived its name from the family du Puy ; and the proprietor, whom our author means, was Jacques du Puy, who was librarian to the King of France, and died in 1656. Mill and Wetstein frequently speak of Jacques, and his brother Pierre, under the name of fratres Puteani.

PAGE 245.

134. The following is the account given in the Catalogus Codd. MStorum Bibl. Regiæ, Tom. II. p. 19. *Ex illo exemplari triginta quinque folia nefario cujusdam scelere aliquot abhinc annis avulsa sunt, quæ Comitiss Oxoniensis Harleii, suo in literas amore celeberrimi, munificentia in pristinas sedes rediere.*

135. No man has examined the readings of this manuscript with so much accuracy, as Dr. Semler in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. IV. p. 8—61. where he has completely rescued the Cod. Claromontanus from the charge of having been corrupted from the Latin. The nature of the subject admits not an extract, but the whole deserves to be translated, that those who are unacquainted with German may derive advantage from the principles of this great master in the art of criticism.

PAGE 246.

136. The reading *γυναικας* instead of *γυναικες* is so easily explained as an error either of the eye in copying, or of the ear in dictating, that the intervention of the Syriac version seems wholly superfluous; but in this example it cannot possibly have occasioned the reading in question, for the Syriac ܡܢ is not *γυναικας*, but *γυναιξι*. A Greek translation of the whole passage would be ἀπεδωκαν ταις γυναιξι τας υἱας αὐτῶν ἐξ ἀναστασεως τῶν νεκρῶν, but our author puts together a set of Greek words without meaning, as corresponding to the Syriac; and in order to render the impropriety of his translation *γυναικας* the less visible, translates not ܡܢ, saying that he cannot conjecture what the Greek verb might have been. An author of less eminence than Michaelis might here be said to trifle.

137. Perhaps the following statement will render this example more intelligible than the statement of our author. The only expression, in which the text of both the Claromontanus and Augiensis differs from the common text, is *εις εαυτες*, instead of *εις αυτον*, Heb. xii. 3. The word which corresponds in the Syriac version is ܫܡܝܢ, sibi ipsis: in this single expression therefore the Claromontanus and Augiensis differ from the common Greek, and coincide with the Syriac. But our author has not observed that they in fact materially differ from the Syriac; for the words which he has quoted from this version occupy precisely that place in the sentence, which in these MSS. is allotted to *εις εαυτες αντιλογιαν*, but instead of expressing this reading, expresses *οι εαυτοις αντελεγον*, which must have been the reading of the Greek manuscript from which the Syriac version was made, and gives the sentence a totally different turn from that which is found in the Claromontanus. It appears then that the whole inquiry must be confined to these three words, which have been written, through the carelessness of transcribers, three different ways, 1. *εις αυτον αντιλογιαν*, the common reading. 2. *εις αυτες (εαυτες) αντιλογιαν*, the

reading of the Augienſis and Claromontanus. 3. οἱ αὐτοῖς (ἑαυτοῖς) ἀντελεγον, the reading of the Greek MS. from which the Syriac verſion was made.

PAGE 247.

138. Here is a diſplay of Syriac literature, to account for the omiſſion of a word, that was occaſioned by the negligence of a copyiſt. The genuine Greek text is *ψηφλωμενῳ ὀρει καὶ κεκαυμενῳ πυρι*: but a tranſcriber, in the hurry of copying, omits *ὀρει*, and writes *ψηφλωμενῳ καὶ κεκαυμενῳ πυρι*, and a tranſcript, in which this miſtake had been made, falls into the hands of the Syriac tranſlator, who faithfully renders what he finds in his copy. A ſimilar accident happens to the writer of the Claromontanus, who omits ‘montem’ in the Latin tranſlation, but not *ὀρει* in the Greek. Now as miſtakes of this kind happen daily and hourly, it requires a lively imagination to diſcover a myſterious analogy between the Syriac and the Latin. Our author’s mode of reſtoring the ſuppoſed genuine Syriac text is ingenious, but not ſolid: for there is no reaſon to conclude that the preſent reading is ſpurious, becauſe it is incomprehenſible. A tranſlator muſt abide by his original; and if a paſſage, as it ſtands in the tranſcript, from which he tranſlates, is in itſelf unintelligible, the ſame obſcurity will be unavoidably retained in the tranſlation. The tranſlator of this Introduction, though the German is as familiar to him as his native language, has been obliged more than once to tranſlate a ſentence word for word, of which he has been wholly unable to comprehend the meaning.

139. Is it poſſible that our author could be ignorant of Dr. Semler’s admirable eſſay on this manuſcript, mentioned in Note 135. an eſſay published almoſt twenty years before the laſt edition of this Introduction?

PAGE 248.

140. Among other arguments, which Wetſtein uſes, to prove that the Codex Claromontanus was not written as a continuation of the Codex Bezae, he ſays that the
pages

pages in the former are much shorter than those in the latter. He has not mentioned the number of lines in each page of the Claromontanus, but I have been informed by a friend, who has examined this manuscript, that they amount only to twenty-one; but in the Codex Bezae they amount to thirty-three. The same person likewise related that in the Claromontanus the words *Ἰησους* and *Χριστος* are abbreviated $\overline{\text{IC}}$, and $\overline{\text{XC}}$: but in the Codex Bezae they are abbreviated $\overline{\text{IHC}}$ and $\overline{\text{XPC}}$. Nor are the letters precisely the same in the two manuscripts, especially in the Latin, as appears from a comparison of the Codex Bezae, with the specimens of the Codex Claromontanus, given by Montfaucon and Blanchini, in the *Palæographia Græca*, p. 217. and the *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, P. I. p. 532. pl. iv.

With respect to the antiquity of the Codex Claromontanus, it is supposed by Montfaucon to have been written in the seventh century. He has described it in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 217. and in the plate fronting this page he has given a fac simile of its characters. Though written in uncial letters, it has accents and marks of aspiration, of which Montfaucon says, ‘*secundâ manu, ut videtur, nec diu, ut creditur, post descriptum codicem adjecti sunt.*’ The marks of aspiration are not of the modern semicircular form, but are written thus, * for the spiritus asper, and † for the spiritus lenis, which marks may likewise be seen in R. Stephens’s edition of 1550, on the capital letters. This MS. was probably written in the West of Europe, not only because it has a Latin translation, but because the epistle to the Hebrews is written at the end; and in the catalogue of the books of the N. T. which is placed after the epistle to Philemon, no mention is made of the epistle to the Hebrews. It is placed, as Simon observes, (*Hist. crit. du Texte du N. T.* ch. xxx. p. 362.) *a la fin de ces livres comme hors d’œuvre, et comme une piece, qui n’est point de la même autorité, que les autres.* To this may be added, what neither Simon nor Wetstein have noted, that this epistle is written even by a later hand, and was therefore wholly

excluded from the canon by the original writer of the manuscript. This I mention on the authority of the same person, whom I quoted before. Now as the epistle to the Hebrews was, during a considerable time, rejected by the church of Rome, but not by the Greek church, it is certain that the Cod. Claromontanus was written in a country, that was under the dominion of the former.

CODICES COISLINIANI.

141. The Codices Coisliniani take their name from Coislin, Bishop of Metz, to whom they were bequeathed by the celebrated chancellor Seguier, who died in 1672. They are preserved at present in the Benedictine library of St. Germain des Prez, and are described in the following work. *Bibliotheca Coisliniana, olim Seguieriana, seu MStorum omnium Græcorum, quæ in ea continentur, accurata descriptio, ubi operum singulorum notitia datur, ætas cujusque MSti indicatur, vetustiorum specimina exhibentur, aliaque multa annotantur quæ ad palæographiam Græcam pertinent.* Studio et opera B. de Montfaucon. Parisiis 1715, fol. But this excellent work is at present extremely scarce. They are likewise enumerated in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 1041—1123.

142. Wetstein refers this MS. not to the eighth, but the seventh century, Tom. II. p. 451. and Montfaucon says of it, *Codex 1. membranaceus inter præstantissimos Europæ numerandus, sexto, vel cum tardissime septimo sæculo exaratus.* He has described it at length in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 1—32. and p. 3. he has given a fac simile of its characters. See also the *Evang. Quadruplex*, P. I. p. 532. It is written in uncial letters, and with accents and marks of aspiration; but Montfaucon adds, p. 1. *non ita diligenter, adeo ut certis in locis penitus omittantur, et aliquando folia pene integra iis destituta deprehendas.*

143. Our author here follows Wetstein, who supposes that the Codex Coislinianus 23 was written in the twelfth century; but Montfaucon refers it to the eleventh century.

ture. See his description of this manuscript in the *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 66. The three preceding manuscripts, viz. the *Codd. Coisliniani* 20, 21, 22, are described in the same work, p. 63—66. from which it appears that all four are accompanied with commentaries. The *Codex Coislin.* 20 is described by Montfaucon as very elegantly written; and he refers it, not to the eleventh, but to the tenth century.

PAGE 249.

144. Namely, in the book of Revelation, in which Storr, on a more accurate examination, discovered seventeen various readings, which had been overlooked by Wetstein.

145. I know not why our author supposes that Wetstein has not noted all the chasms of this manuscript. Wetstein's account is the only one, which has been given: for though Montfaucon mentions the manuscript in the *Bibl. Coislin.* p. 250. he is totally silent with respect to the chasms.

PAGE 250.

146. That this manuscript was sent by Michael Palæologus to Louis IX. appears from the Dedication. *Μιχαηλ εν Χριστω τω Θεω πικτος βασιλευς, κ. τ. λ.* See Wetstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 49. But these premises alone afford no decisive argument, that the manuscript was also written in the thirteenth century, though Montfaucon conjectures that it was.

147. Wetstein, in his description of the *Codices Coisliniani*, has constantly adhered to the numbers which were affixed to them in the Coislin library, and by which they are noted by Montfaucon in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, as I have found, on comparing this work with Wetstein's *Prolegomena*. Nor has Wetstein been guilty of a mistake, in affixing the same number to two different manuscripts; for both the *Codex H* and *Codex 22* in the second part of Wetstein's N. T. are marked by the same number CCII in the *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*.

But the latter is distinguished from the former by the addition of the figure 2 under the second C, in the following manner CCII. See Montfaucon's description of it, p. 263. of the *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*. In the second part therefore of Wetstein's Greek Testament,

Codex H=Codex Coislinianus CCII.

Codex 22=Codex Coislinianus CCII.

148. If the writer of this manuscript altered the common reading *επεθησαν* into *επεθησαν* by design, and intended it as an ingenious conjecture, as our author supposes, he has displayed his ingenuity at the expence of his knowledge, for there is no such word as *επεθησαν* in the Greek language. It is the mistake of an ignorant, or careless transcriber, who mistook τ for π; and it is found in this manuscript alone.

149. A critical description of the readings of this manuscript is given in Semler's *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. IV. p. 175—179.

150. No error has taken place, either of the writer, or of the printer, in regard to the number affixed to this manuscript in Wetstein's *Prolegomena*, as appears from Note 147. This manuscript, or rather fragment, for it consists only of fourteen leaves, is described by Montfaucon in his *Bibl. Coisliniana*, p. 251—261. and p. 262. he has given a fac simile of its characters. See also the *Evang. Quadruplex*, P. I. p. 532. plate 2. It appears from Montfaucon's description that it is one of the most ancient manuscripts now extant. 'Codex CCII. membranaceus, constans foliis 14. complectens partem epistolarum Pauli, inter antiquissimos Europæ numerandus, sæculi nempe V. vel VI. cujus et originem et fortunam ex notis non dubiis enarrare aggredimur. Scriptus esse videtur in Palæstina vel Syria eovcirciter, quo diximus, ævo,' &c. This manuscript has been re-collated by Griesbach.

151. It appears likewise from a note written in the margin, opposite to Acts vii. 29. that it belonged to a church in Constantinople. See Wetstein, Vol. II. p. 12.

CODICES

CODICES COLBERTINI.

152. The Codices Colbertini, which were collected by the celebrated Colbert, minister of the marine to Louis XIV. are at present in the royal library in Paris, for which they were purchased by Cardinal Fleury. They are described in general in the *Bibliotheca Colbertina*, Parisiis 1728, P. II. 8vo. and in *Montfaucon Bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 922—1014. But several of Colbert's manuscripts, and especially those of the Greek Testament, appear to have been separated from the rest of the Colbert library, and placed among the MSS. which were before in the royal library. For of all the Codices Colbertini enumerated by our author, not one is to be found in Montfaucon's Catalogue of the Colbert library; and in the places to which the fifteen numbers respectively belong there are chasms in the notation, except N°. 1241. which is an evident erratum, because this number is a MS. of Jamblichus. The Colbert MSS. of the Greek Testament therefore must be sought among the Codices Regii, in the second volume of the *Catalogus Codd. MSS. Bibl. Regiæ*. A fac simile of the characters of one of the most ancient of these MSS. is given in the first plate annexed to P. I. p. 492. of *Blanchini Evangeliarium quadruplex*. See also *Montfaucon Palæographia Græca*, p. 229. where a fac simile is given of the *Codex Colbertinus 700*. which is written in very large uncial letters, with accents, and marks of aspiration, and referred by Montfaucon to the eighth century. This is *Wetstein's Evangelistarium 1*. and is mentioned by our author, N°. 93. Several other Codices Colbertini are described by Montfaucon in the same work; but, if we except that, which is just mentioned, and the *Cod. Colbertinus 5149*. which will be described in the sequel under the title *Codex Cyprius*, the others described by Montfaucon are not MSS. of the Greek Testament.

PAGE 251.

153. But he has specified many of them in his *Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T.* ch. 33.

154. Not by Mill, but by La Roque, who collated this manuscript in the library of Colbert. See Mill's *Prolegomena*, § 1474.

PAGE 252.

155. Wetstein says only, Ita Millius de suo Codice Colb. 2. quæ tamen ex lectionibus ab ipso notatis eundem hætenus deprehendere non potui. But Semler has examined the readings of this MS. with great accuracy in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 214—219. He has shewn that it contains valuable readings, that they very frequently coincide with Wetstein's Codex 91. and not seldom with the Cod. Cant. and Codex Reuchlini.

156. The words of Mill in his *Prolegomena*, § 1476. are the following, Quarta collationes exhibit partium codicis cujusdam evangeliorum ab invicem, nescio quo pacto, discerptarum. Prior pars, Codicis scil. n. 4444. variationes e sedecim prioribus capp. Matthæi excerptas continet: posterior (quæ est codicis istius bibliothecæ, n. 6083.) lectiones e reliquo Matthæi evangelio, &c. Now the word quarta at the beginning of the sentence signifies the fourth part of that collection of Various Readings from the Colbert MSS. which had been communicated to him by Allix (*Proleg.* § 1473), the first part of which contained extracts from the Colb. 6043. the second from the Colb. 4705. and the third from the Colb. 6066. (*Proleg.* § 1473, 1474, 1475.) But it appears that the fourth part of this collection of readings was subdivided into two portions, the one containing extracts from the Colb. 4444. the manuscript in question, the other from the Codex 6083. No doubt therefore can be made that the Colb. 4444. was a MS. of the Gospels, not merely a collection of readings, which would have hardly been ranked among the Colbert MSS. of the Greek Testament.

157. It may be observed in regard to the notation of the Codd. Colbertini, in Mill's Greek Testament, that as the words *prima*, *secunda*, &c. in his Prolegomena § 1473—1477. refer to the several parts of the above-mentioned collection, the fourth part of which contains extracts from *two* MSS. the Colb. 4444 and 6083, it follows that both of them are included in the notation Colb. 4. among the various readings. Nor is the notation improper, for though the two manuscripts are bound separately, the one is only a continuation of the other, for Mill calls them *Partes codicis cujusdam evangeliorum, ab invicem, nescio quo pacto, discerptæ*.

158. This mistake was occasioned by Wettstein having assigned two numbers to the two parts of the same manuscript, which Mill quotes under the title Colb. 4.

PAGE 253.

159. See Note 156, 157.

160. The three parts of this manuscript are quoted in Mill's Greek Testament by three different numbers for the same reason, as the two above-mentioned are quoted under one number. Mill received from Allix two separate collections of readings of the Colbert manuscripts, the first of which has been mentioned Note 156: this first collection consisted of six parts (Proleg. § 1473—1477) the last of which contained extracts from the Colb. 2844. in the Acts of the Apostles (Prol. § 1477.) whence this part of Colb. 2844. acquired the name of Colb. 6. Sometime afterwards he received a second collection of readings (Proleg. § 1490) which consisted of two parts, the former containing extracts from the Colb. 2844. in the epistles (Prol. § 1490) the second in the Gospels (Prol. § 1492). To prevent mistakes therefore in regard to the notations of Mill and Wettstein, the following statement is necessary.

Mill's Cod. Colb. 6. = Wettstein's Cod. 13. in 3d. part.

————— Colb. 7. = ————— Cod. 17. in 2d. part.

————— Colb. 8. = ————— Cod. 33. in 1st. part.

161. Also

161. Also by the old Syriac, the Coptic, Ethiopic, and Philoxenian in the margin.

COD. CORSENDONCENSIS.

PAGE 162.

162. Fuit olim Collegii Corfendoncensis in Quempinia.
Wetsteinii Prol. p. 45.

163. Here our author appears to have misunderstood Wetstein. The common text of the passage in question is δεξασθαι ημας' και ε καθως ηλπισαμεν, κ. τ. λ. Wetstein quotes 33 MSS. for the omission of δεξασθαι ημας, but of his Cod. 3. in particular he says, habet (scil. δεξασθαι ημας) addita nota εν πολλοις των αντιγραφων ουτως ευρηται. But our author has written this note between δεξασθαι ημας and και ε καθως ηλπισαμεν, as if it had been inserted by the writer of the Codex Corfendoncensis in the text itself, which is improbable, and by no means warranted by Wetstein's quotation.

This note I had written in the first edition: but I have since found, that I am mistaken. The Codex Corfendoncensis, has really (strange as it may appear) εν πολλοις των αντιγραφων ετως ευρηται in the *text*. See Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. II. p. 594.

164. The MS. when collated by Walker was in the library of a Dominican convent in Bruffels. Wetstein's Prol. p. 46.

165. Treschow says, Codex in Auctario decimus quintus. It is therefore numbered 15 in the Auctarium or Appendix to the catalogue of manuscripts which is kept in the imperial library. Complete extracts are given from this manuscript in Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. I. p. 704—750. and Vol. II. p. 559—630.

CODICES COTTONIANI.

166. A fac simile of the characters of this MS. is given in Blanchini Evangeliarium Quadruplex, P. I. in the second plate annexed to p. 492. It is remarkable
that

that this manuscript is written on paper, though with uncial letters. Both Le Long and Westein call it *charta Ægyptiaca, purpurei coloris*. See Le Long *Bib. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 180. and Wettstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 40. The Cotton MSS. which are now preserved in the British Museum, are described in Smith's *Bibliotheca Cottoniana*, printed at Oxford in 1696, fol.

CODICES COVELLIANI.

PAGE 256.

These manuscripts, which were brought from the East by Dr. Covell, came afterwards into the hands of Harley, Earl of Oxford, and with the rest of the Harleian MSS. into the British Museum. They are described in the Catalogue of the Harleian manuscripts, London 1759, 2 vols. folio.

167. At present in the British Museum, and noted Harleianus 5776, as is related by Griesbach.

168. It is noted in the British Museum Harleianus 5537. It has been again examined by Griesbach.

169. From the Coislin. 25. and 202.

170. It is noted at present 5620. among the Harleian MSS. Griesbach, who has examined it, relates that it generally agrees with the Genevensis 1.

CODIX CROMWELLI.

This MS. which was examined by Griesbach, our author has neglected to mention. It contains, beside other matters which relate not to the present subject, lessons from the four Gospels. It belonged formerly to Oliver Cromwell, and came with the rest of his manuscripts into the Bodleian, where it is marked among Cromwell's manuscripts 117. See the *Catal. MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ*, Tom. I. P. I. p. 44. In Griesbach's list of *Evangelistaria* it is numbered 30, but he has not yet described it, because the description of the *Evangelistaria* is deferred to the second volume of the *Symbolæ*, which is not yet published.

CODIX

CODEX CYPRIUS.

Montfaucon has described this manuscript in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 231. and has given a fac simile of its characters, p. 232. He refers it to the eighth century. It is written in uncial letters, with certain marks over them, which Montfaucon calls ‘*notulæ quædam et lineolæ, ad inflexiones vocum in officio ecclesiastico inter legendum observari solitæ.*’ It is at present in the royal library in Paris, where it is marked 63.

CODEX DOUZÆ.

Where this manuscript is preserved at present is unknown. All that Wettstein says of it is, that it was brought from Constantinople by Douza, and seen by Gomarus at Leyden, who examined it for the story of the adulteress in the eighth chapter of St. John. It is reasonable however to suppose, that it is in the University Library at Leyden, and perhaps is the very same manuscript as that which is noted 74 among the Greek and Latin MSS. and described p. 337 of the folio catalogue printed in 1716, in the following manner: *Quatuor evangelia, quæ incipiunt ab historia quinque millium satiatorum per quinque panes et duos pisces, Græce et Latine, etsi Græca videantur magis nova, et non serie continua.*

CODEX DUBLINENSIS.

PAGE 257.

171. Another manuscript preserved in the library of Trinity College in Dublin, written in uncial letters, and of great antiquity, containing the Gospel of St. Matthew, is described in the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy for 1787, p. 121—138. At the end of the last page is a fac simile of its characters. But as it has never been collated, it belongs not to the present catalogue.

CODEX

CODEX EPHREM.

PAGE 258.

172. This MS. is described in the *Catalogus MStorum* Bibl. Reg. Tom. II. p. 2—7. A fac simile of its characters is given by Montfaucon in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 214. He describes it p. 213. Griesbach, in his *Symbolæ criticæ*, p. viii. relates that it has the *τιτλοι* and *κεφαλαια* of Eusebius a primâ manu. But it is written without accents.

PAGE 259.

173. Instead of the common reading *εις καθ' εις* the Codex Ephrem has not *εκατος* as our author says, but *εις εκατος*, as appears from both Wetstein and Griesbach.

PAGE 260.

174. See Note 4. to ch. vi. sect. 10.

175. The Codex Ephrem has many marginal notes written in uncial letters without accents. See Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 213, 214. This proves what has been sometimes doubted, that marginal notes were made in the most ancient manuscripts, and that this practice prevailed in the early ages of christianity. But these marginal scholia seem to have been confined to such MSS. as were in the hands of private persons, while those, which have been used for church service, such as the Codex Bezae, are without them. It is likewise remarkable that in this manuscript the disputed, or rather spurious verse John v. 4. is written not in the text, but as a marginal scholion. See the Specimen given by Montfaucon, p. 214. Now as this verse is totally omitted in the Codex Bezae, and the Codex Vaticanus, which are the two most ancient MSS. now extant; is likewise omitted in the text of the Codex Ephrem, (which is somewhat inferior in age to the Codex Bezae) but written in the margin as a scholion; is written in more modern manuscripts in the text itself, but marked with an asterisk, or an obelus, as suspicious; and in manuscripts still more modern is written without any mark; we see the various gradations

gradations by which it has acquired its place in our present text, and have proof positive that the verse was originally nothing more than a marginal scholion, and of course spurious. Other passages likewise in the Greek Testament owe their present existence in the printed editions to the same cause.

Wetstein supposed that the Codex Ephrem was one of the MSS. which were collated at Alexandria in 616, with the New Syriac version, but this opinion has been confuted by Dr. Ridley in the 15th section of his *Diff. de vers. Syriacis*. Adler likewise on collating the marginal readings of the Philoxenian version seems to have found none that were peculiar to the Codex Ephrem. At least he has mentioned none in his *Versiones Syriacæ*, p. 131. But though the Codex Ephrem was not collated at Alexandria in 616. it is certainly as ancient as the seventh century. See Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 212, 213. Wetstein goes still further, and argues from a marginal note to Heb. vii. 7. that it was written before the institution of the feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, that is, before the year 542. See his *Prolegomena*, p. 28.

CODICES ESCURIALENSES.

Here may be inserted the Codices Escorialenses, collated by Professor Moldenhawer and described in Birch's *Prolegomena*, p. 61—84.

1. Escorialensis 1, an Evangelistarium, supposed by Moldenhawer to have been written in the tenth century.

2. Escorialensis 2, contains all the books of the N. T. except the Revelation, and in the following order, the Gospels, Acts, catholic Epistles, and lastly those of St. Paul. It is of the octavo size, very neatly written on vellum, in small characters, and referred by Moldenhawer to the end of the 11th or the beginning of the 12th century.

3. Escorialensis 3, an Evangelistarium, written for the use of a church in Constantinople, and referred by Moldenhawer to the beginning of the 10th century.

4. Escuria-

4. Escorialensis 4, an Evangelistarium, likewise brought from Constantinople. These two last mentioned MSS. Moldenhawer describes as of little value.

5. Escorialensis 5, a manuscript of the four Gospels, written probably in the 13th century.

6. Escorialensis 6, an Evangelistarium, supposed to be written toward the close of the 11th century.

7. Escorialensis 7, written in the 14th century, and containing the Gospels, the Acts, and the 14 epistles of St. Paul.

8. Escorialensis 8, a manuscript of the four Gospels, written in the year 1140, as appears from its subscription.

9. Escorialensis 9, a manuscript of the four Gospels, and according to its subscription written by one Luke a monk in 1014.

10. Escorialensis 10, contains the four Gospels, and written, as Moldenhawer supposes, in the 12th century.

11. Escorialensis 11, a manuscript of the Gospels, but supposed to be not more ancient than the 13th century.

12. Escorialensis 12, contains the four Gospels, and is referred by Moldenhawer to the 11th century.

For further information see the above-quoted Prolegomena. The readings of these MSS. are quoted in Birch's edition of the Greek Testament: those which Moldenhawer discovered on a second collation, and which came too late to be printed under the text, are given in the Prolegomena, in the description of each manuscript. He has likewise collated eight Escorial manuscripts of the Acts and the Epistles, but the description of these is not yet published. Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 616—625. has given a catalogue of the *Codices Escorialensis*, but what is very extraordinary the manuscripts of the Greek Testament are not particularly specified. He says in general terms, p. 624. *Quatuor Evangeliorum codices bene multi, Græce. Acta Apostolorum, et Epistolæ Pauli, necnon alii biblici libri in permultis Græcis codicibus extant.* But this neglect is to be ascribed, not to Montfaucon, but to the person who made the catalogue.

CODICES FLORENTINI.

PAGE 261.

176. Professor Birch, in his *Prolegomena*, p. 50—53, has described seventeen manuscripts of the Gospels preserved at Florence in the *Bibliotheca Laurentiana*. He has not regularly collated them, but only inspected them in particular passages. Fourteen of them are preserved in the book case which is marked VI, and are numbered 11. 14, 15, 16. 18. 23. 25. 27, 28, 29, 30. 32, 33, 34. Two of them are numbered 12. 14. in the book-case marked VIII; and the seventeenth which was brought 'ex bibliotheca *Ædilium Florentinæ ecclesiæ*' is marked 256. It appears from the short account, which Birch has given of them, that they are all written on vellum, and most of them in the 11th or 12th century. He has also mentioned two *Lectionaria* preserved at present in the same library, which he has quoted John vii. 53. under the title *Lect. Flor.* 1, 2.

In the Benedictine monastery dedicated to the Virgin Mary he found two manuscripts of the Gospels, the former of which he quotes Mark xvi. 9. John vii. 53. the latter Matth. xxvii. 16, 17. John vii. 53. But he has taken no notice of a very ancient *Codex rescriptus*, preserved in the same library, which Montfaucon in his *Palaographia Græca*, p. 180. describes as follows. *Codex bibliothecæ B. M. Benedictinorum Florentiæ, ubi, delectis erasisque prioribus, Sophoclis carmina superscripta sunt. Prius autem erat Novum Testamentum caractere quadro et rotundo sine accentibus.* It appears therefore that some parts of the Greek Testament are still visible. In the Dominican Convent dedicated to St. Mark he found two MSS. of the whole N. T. and one of the Gospels, which he has quoted only at the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth chapter of St. John. The second MS. containing the whole N. T. he describes in the following manner. *Codex 707 chartaceus, sæculi 15, integrum N. T. complectitur, singulari Græca dialecto,*

Catalogues of the manuscripts preserved in the Medicean and other libraries in Florence are given by Montfaucon in his *Bibl. bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 239—430.

CODEx T. GALE.

A catalogue of Dr. Gale's manuscripts is printed in the *Catalogi librorum MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ* in unum collecti, Tom. II. P. I. p. 185. But where this manuscript in particular is at present, I have not been able to learn.

CODEx GEHLIANUS.

177. Copious extracts have been given from this manuscript by Professor Matthäi in his Appendix to his edition of St. Mark's Gospel, p. 277—318.

CODICES GENEVENSES.

178. These two manuscripts are preserved in the library belonging to the city of Geneva. They are described in the *Catalogue raisonné des manuscrits conservés dans la bibliothèque de la ville de Genève*, par Jean Sennebier, Genève, 1779, 8vo. p. 27—34.

CODICES GUELPHERBYTANI.

PAGE 262.

179. Here our author must have forgotten Griesbach's
 Vol. II. A a a Greek

Greek Testament, in which this manuscript is quoted by the title *Codex P*.

180. This MS. is quoted by Griesbach by the title *Codex Q*. A critical examination of the readings of these two MSS. is given by Semler in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. IV. p. 287—298.

PAGE 263.

181. The German title of this work is *Knittels neue Kritiken über 1 John v. 7*.

182. *Knittels Beyträge zur Kritik über die Offenbarung Johannis*.

183. Griesbach says of this MS. *Rarius nominatim excitamus, quoniam fere semper concinit cum codicibus 9. 14. et aliis*.

184. This reading is *ανεμεις* for *αγγελεις*.

185. This MS. is quoted by Griesbach in the book of Revelation by the title *Codex 30*. From the Acts and the Epistles copious extracts are given by Professor Matthäi in the Appendix to his edition of St. Mark's Gospel, p. 322—363. He calls it *Codex x*.

PAGE 264.

186. Here our author reviews the publication of Knittel mentioned Note 181.

CODEX GONVILLI ET CAII.

187. It is probable that Mill made some additions to the extracts of the London Polyglot, for he says of this manuscript, Prol. § 1419. *videre et sedulo perlustrare contigit*. This MS. has the Ammonian sections, without the references to the canons of Eusebius.

CODEX GOOGII.

188. Dr. Fell, in his catalogue of MSS. at the end of the preface to his Gr. Test. enumerates among others an *Evangelium D. Goodii*, from which he quotes readings by the letter g. But Fell probably meant no other than the

the Codex Googii, for he says in his preface, exhibemus insuper quæ Biblia Polyglotta Anglicana addidere. As Walton therefore has no Codex Goodii, nor Fell a Codex Googii, it is certain that they both meant the same manuscript; and this is confirmed by a comparison of Fell's quotations with those of Walton, which I have found to agree, though Fell has not produced all the extracts given by Walton.

189. Wetstein must therefore suppose that his Codd. 62, 63, 93. are one and the same manuscript under different names: or that it was first in the possession of Gravius, then of Googe, and afterwards purchased by Usher. But this conjecture is not probable, as will appear from Note 326.

CODICES HAVNIENSES.

190. This manuscript and the two following are described in Birch's Prolegomena, p. 89—92. and extracts are given from them among the various readings to his Greek Testament. In the volume of the Or. Bib. to which our author refers, are only extracts from Henfler's Notitia. This work was published at Copenhagen in 1784, 8vo.

PAGE 266.

191. Namely in the epistles. See Griesbach's Greek Testament, Vol. II. p. 4. What the abbreviation Hal. signifies is wholly unknown. All that Griesbach says of it in the place just mentioned is, Codex nescio quis, cujus excerpta, adjectâ nota Hal., extant in margine exemplaris editionis Millianæ, quod asservatur in bibliotheca Bodleiana.

192. Griesbach, in his Symbolæ criticæ, p. 245. relates that they were made partly by Mill and partly by Hearne.

193. If the abbreviation Hal. denotes a manuscript, it must have likewise contained the Gospels, for Griesbach says in his Symbolæ, p. 246. Curavi ut annotationes quæ ad priora Matthæi capita et ad epistolas Apostolorum

tolorum spectant, saltem potiores, descriptas in patriam mecum apportarem. He has published his extracts from St. Matthew, at the end of his *Symbolæ*.

CODICES HARLEIANI.

194. These MSS. are preserved in the British Museum, and are described in the 'Catalogue of the Harleian Collection of manuscripts purchased by authority of Parliament for the use of the publick, and preserved in the British Museum London 1759. 2 Vols. folio. The first person who collated any of these manuscripts, was Griesbach, who has enumerated ten of them in the different catalogues of MSS. prefixed to the several parts of his Greek Testament. Of these our author mentions only five, which are all MSS. of the Gospels, namely those marked 1810, 5540, 5559, 5567, 5731, which Griesbach has described in his *Symbolæ criticæ*, p. clxxxii—ccii. After having given an account of these MSS. our author adds, that there are six other Harleian manuscripts, containing the epistles, and marked 5552, 5588, 5613, 5620, 5778, 5796, one of which (5778) formerly belonged to Dr. Covel, and has been described above, under the title Covel. 5: but of the remaining five he says, that they belong not to the present catalogue, because no extracts have ever been given of them. Now it is evident that he has copied these numbers from Griesbach: but two of them he has copied wrong, and he is likewise mistaken in saying that they have not been collated, for all five are numbered by Griesbach in his Greek Testament, who says in particular of the Codex 5613, 'a nobis collatum.' I will therefore give an account of them as far as relates to their contents, though I am unable to describe them critically, because they belong to the second volume of the *Symbolæ criticæ*, which Griesbach has not yet published.

Harleianus 5552, a manuscript of all the Epistles; noted by Griesbach 66. in St. Paul's Epistles, 63. in the Catholic Epistles. But Griesbach, in the second volume
of

of his *Symbolæ criticæ* has shewn, that this MS. is nothing more than a transcript of the first edition of Erasmus.

Harleianus 5588, a manuscript of the Acts and all the Epistles; noted by Griesbach 59. in the Acts and the Catholic Epistles, and 62. in the Epistles of St. Paul.

Harleianus 5613, a manuscript of the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation; noted by Griesbach 60. in the Acts and the Catholic Epistles, 63. in the Epistles of St. Paul, and 29. in the Revelation, in which book it is defective from ch. xxii. 2. to the end.

Harleianus 5650, Griesbach's *Evangelistarium* 25. Of this manuscript Griesbach says, that he only cursorily inspected it.

Harleianus 5731, contains fragments of a *Lectonarium*, and is noted by Griesbach *Lectonarium* 4, in St. Paul's Epistles.

Griesbach likewise relates, in the Catalogue of manuscripts prefixed to St. Paul's epistles, that the *Codex Harleianus* 5613, beside the contents, which have been already mentioned of this manuscript, has also a fragment containing a part of the epistles to the Corinthians, namely, 1 Cor. xv. 25—2 Cor. i. 15. and 2 Cor. x. 13.—xii. 5. This fragment is quoted by Griesbach by the figure 64. Our author therefore has neglected to mention six Harleian manuscripts, which have been either wholly, or partially collated.

CODEX HIRSAUGIENSIS.

PAGE 267.

195. This MS. derives its name from the writer Nicolaus, monachus Hirsaugienfis. When collated by Bengel it was the property of Uffenbach. *Wetstenii Prolegomena*, p. 57. This manuscript appears to be the same as that which Griesbach has noted also 122. and has termed *Gieffenfis*, as being preserved in the University Library at Gieffen. Bengel describes the MS. in question as follows: *Hirsaugienfis continet Evangelium se-*

A a a 3

cundum

cundum Johannem scriptumque se fatetur per Nicolaum monachum Hirsaugiensem; convenit autem singulariter, cum Codice Trithemii apud Millium. Apparatus criticus, p. 9. ed. 2da. Now Professor Schulze discovered in the University library at Gießen a manuscript of St. John's Gospel, which formerly belonged to Uffenbach, which had been collated by Maius, whose extracts are likewise preserved in that library, and which our author has printed in his *Orient. Bibl.* Vol. II. p. 243—252. In his preface to these extracts Maius gives the following account of the MS. itself. *Evangelium S. Johannis Græcum sistit exaratum satis eleganter anno MD manu Nicolai, monachi Hirsaugienfis, ut in calce voluminis patet.* And at the end of the extracts he adds, *Facile ex hisce cuivis judicare licet de præstantia hujus MSti, ad cujus laudes hoc imprimis pertinet, quod cum Codice Evangelii S. Johannis Jo. Trithemii manu exarato prorsus conveniat, et ex illo descriptus videatur.* The identity therefore of the two manuscripts seems to be sufficiently ascertained. I have likewise compared the extracts from the Cod. Gießensis with Wetstein's quotations from the Hirsaugienfis, his Codex 97. and found that their readings are not contradictory to each other. For instance John i. 29. both omit *ο Ιωαννης*, v. 44. both add *ο Ιησους*. On the other hand Maius has noted variations in the Cod. Gießensis, where Wetstein has not quoted his Cod. 97. but this is no argument against the identity of the manuscripts, since Wetstein has here only copied from Bengel, who never gave complete extracts from any manuscript, but noted only what appeared remarkable.

CODICES HUNTINGDONIANI.

196. The Codd. Huntingdoniani are at present in the Bodleian, and are described in the *Catalogi MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti*, T. I. p. 279—285.

CODICES LAUDIANI.

The Codices Laudiani, which are preserved in the Bodleian, are described in the *Catalogi Libr. MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti*, Tom. I P. I. p. 46 — 6. The numbers 1, 2, 3. &c. by which they are usually quoted, are not the numbers annexed to them in the Bodleian, but were adopted by Mill, for the sake of brevity.

PAGE 270.

197. See Woide's *Prolegomena*, § 30.

198. *Proleg.* § 77. where many examples are produced in which the Latin has been altered from the Greek, not the Greek from the Latin.

PAGE 272.

199. We cannot positively affirm that the Greek text in the Laud 3. differs in this example from the Latin, for the writer of this manuscript, as well as the author of the Vulgate, might have considered *αν* not as a potential particle, but as an hypothetical conjunction.

200. It is true that the Syriac version expresses *εισησεαν*, but the Syriac text is not ܐܕܕܐ, as our author says, who seems to have quoted from memory, but ܐܕܕܐ ܐܕܕܐ.

PAGE 273.

201. Woide likewise, immediately over the fac simile representing *δουξ Σαοδινιας*, has given a fac simile representing the text of the manuscript itself, from which it is manifest, that the former was written not only by a very different hand, but in a much later age than the manuscript itself. But it might still have been written in Sardinia, though Woide § 76. supposes that it was written in the East, because its orthography has several properties observable in the Alexandrinus. But as these are also found in other very ancient manuscripts, they are insufficient to warrant the inference, when we reflect on

the great improbability that a Greek manuscript written in the East, should be accompanied with a Latin translation. This Latin translation, contrary to the usual arrangement of the Greek-Latin manuscripts, occupies the first column of the page. It appears from the fac simile which Hearne has given at the end of the preface, as well as from the edition itself, that only one word, at the utmost two, and that seldom, is written in a line; and they are so written that each Latin word is always opposite to the correspondent Greek word. This clearly shews that it was written for the use of a person, who was not well skilled in both languages; and, as the Latin occupies the first column, this circumstance affords an additional argument in favour of the opinion, that it was written in the West of Europe, where Latin only was spoken. With respect to the antiquity of this manuscript, Hearne refers it to the eighth century, for in his preface, which is dated 1715, he says, *Ad codicis antiquitatem quod attinet, mea fert opinio eum esse annorum plus minus mille.* At all events it is less ancient than the Codex Bezae, as appears from the form of the letters, especially the A and the N. The former is not written thus **A** as in the Codex Bezae, but has a more modern shape, the left hand stroke being in general not pointed, but round: and the N is nearly the same as that used by the person, who added the word *ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΜΑ* in different parts of the margin of the Codex Bezae. The sections likewise into which the Laud. 3. is divided, are more numerous than those of the Codex Bezae in the Acts of the Apostles: but the sections of the former, like those of the latter, are nothing more than a subdivision of the Euthalian sections, as I have found on comparing them, for wherever an Euthalian section begins, a new section begins in the Laudianus 3. The first letter of the word, which begins each section, projects into the margin, and is somewhat larger than the other letters, which it exceeds in a greater degree than the first letter of a section exceeds the rest in the Codex Bezae, but in a less degree than in the Codex Alexandrinus. It agrees with

with both these MSS. in not having the sections of the Acts of the Apostles numbered in the margin.

PAGE 274.

202. In the very section to which our author alludes, Woide has actually produced nearly forty examples in which the Laud. 3. agrees with the quotations of Bede. Nor were our author's objections unknown to Woide, who had not only seen, but actually used the third edition of his Introduction, for he has quoted from it a very long passage in the first part of his preface.

203. Published at Copenhagen in 1785, 8vo.

CODEX LEICESTRENSIS.

PAGE 275.

204. The Syriac version, (by which expression is generally understood the old Syriac or Peshito) has not *εἰκοσι τεσσαρες* with the Cod. Leicestrensis, but the common reading *εἰκοσι τρεις*. It is found however in the Philoxenian, and also in the Armenian.

205. Here is nothing more than an extract from the Catalogue of the Library of Cesar de Missy, published in London in 1776.

PAGE 276.

206. It is not in the British Museum. If it was purchased by Dr. Hunter, it must be sought hereafter in the University Library at Glasgow, where Dr. Hunter's manuscripts will be deposited.

207. Wettstein, who had his accounts from de Missy himself, relates very circumstantially that the extracts from the Codex Leicestrensis, were made by Jackson and Tiffin, that these extracts were written by Gee in the margin of the octavo Oxford edition of the Greek Testament, that this copy was purchased by de Missy who lent it to Wettstein in 1748. See his Prolegomena, p. 53. But there is a much more complete collection of readings from

from the Codex Leicestrensis than those given by Wetstein. Jackson, who lived at Leicester, spent a great part of his life in making extracts from this manuscript, which he wrote in red ink in the margin of his copy of Mill's Greek Testament. This copy is now preserved in Jesus College Library in Cambridge, where it is marked O, Θ, 1. On the first of the blank leaves which are prefixed to the title page, Jackson has written, ' In hoc exemplari excuso N. T. habentur *omnes* var. lect. Cod. MS. Leicestrensis post Millium denuo cum diligentia collati. This copy of Mill's Greek Testament with Jackson's marginal readings is a treasure of sacred criticism, which deserves to be communicated to the public. It contains the result of all his labours in that branch of literature, it supplies many of the defects of Mill, and corrects many of his errors: and beside quotations from manuscripts and ancient versions, it contains a copious collection of readings from many of the fathers, which have been hitherto very imperfectly collated, or wholly neglected.

PAGE 277.

208. The description given by Wetstein is circumstantial, clear, and probable: it does not appear to be attended with either mystery or error. Our author therefore must mean, that there is something mysterious, with respect to the origin of this manuscript.

CODEX MANHEIMENSIS.

PAGE 278.

209. In Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek, Vol. III. p. 646—665. is described a manuscript of the four Gospels, written on vellum, consisting of three quarto volumes, and preserved in the Electoral Library at Mannheim. The account was communicated by Mr. Rinck, who relates that it is written in uncial letters, the form of which is between the more ancient and more modern shape

shape of those characters. He has likewise given a specimen of its readings from Math. iv, v. x. xvi. Mark i, ii, iii. ix, x, xi, xii. xviii. Luke iii. v, vi. John ii, iii. which he has compared with the readings of the manuscripts collated by Professor Birch, from which comparison it appears, that, where the Cod. Manheimensis differs from the common text, it agrees principally with the Codd. Vaticanæ 349. 354. 360. 1067. 1209. (the celebrated Cod. Vaticanus) Cod. Urbino-Vaticanus 2. Cod. Lambecii 31. Codd. Havn. 1, 2. This excites a favourable opinion of it, as the manuscripts here mentioned are some of the best, which Birch has collated.

CODICES S. Mariæ IN VALLICELLA.

Here may be likewise inserted the following Codices Sæ. Mariæ in Vallicella in Rome, which Professor Birch has examined in certain places, and described in his Prolegomena, p. 45. They are MSS. of the Gospels.

1. Codex signatus B, 133. membranaceus in forma minori, sæculo ut videtur XII. scriptus.

2. Codex signatus C, 61. membranaceus, scriptus in quarta forma, sæculo XII.

3. Codex signatus C, 73. in octavo, membranaceus, sæculi XI, ut judicat Montfaucon.

4. Codex signatus F, 90. membranaceus, sæculi XII. The first and last of these manuscripts are described in Blanchini Evangeliarium Quadruplex, P. I. p. 529—531. who has also given a fac simile in the plate annexed to p. 527.

CODEx MARSHI.

210. The number 24. denotes not its place in the catalogue of the Bodleian MSS. but is the mark which was affixed to it by its former proprietor, Marsh, Archbishop of Armagh. It is quoted by Griesbach as his Cod. 118. Our author has already described this MS. N°. 52. and

and therefore reckoned the same MS. twice. Griesbach has assigned a place in his catalogue to two other Codices Marshi, 22. and 23. likewise in the Bodleian, and which our author has omitted. They are both of them Evangelistaria, and are numbered by Griesbach 28, and 29: but he says that he only cursorily inspected them.

CODEX MAZARINI.

PAGE 279.

The first person, who printed extracts from this manuscript, was Curcellæus, who in the preface to his Greek Testament, printed at Amsterdam in 1658, gives the following account of it. *Addidi postea alias (scil. varias lectiones) ad Evangelia pertinentes ex MS. Constantinopolitano plusquam octingentorum annorum, qui est in bibliotheca Cardinalis Mazarini, nec non ex alio MS. adhuc vetustiore; utrasque ab amico Lutetia ad me missas.* It is probably the same as that which is now marked 82, in the royal library in Paris, and described in the *Cat. MSS. Bibl. regię*, Tom. II. p. 16. for this is the only MS. of the four Gospels, in the whole library, which formerly belonged to Cardinal Mazarin, (I mean MSS. of the Greek text, for there are several MSS. of Greek commentaries which belonged to him) and it is probable, that whatever manuscripts he had were deposited there after his death. But it is not so ancient as Curcellæus supposed, being referred by the editors of the Paris Catalogue to the twelfth century. I know not why Wetstein has given this MS. a place in his catalogue, and numbered it 103. for I never met with an instance of this number among his various readings. Our author says, that Wetstein has borrowed extracts of this manuscript from the edition of Curcellæus; but this is wholly impossible, for though Curcellæus has given extracts from the Codex Mazarini in the margin of his Greek Testament, yet, as he has quoted his various readings, without ever specifying the particular manuscripts,
from

from which they were taken, it was wholly impossible for Wettstein to distinguish those of the Codex Mazarini from the readings of other manuscripts.

CODICES MEADI.

211. The manuscript described N^o. 3. is Wettstein's Codex 58. in the third part, and contains the Acts and the Epistles, whereas the Cod. Meadi 1. which our author mentions in this number, is a manuscript of the Gospels only. He says also, in the following article, that the Cod. Meadi 3. has likewise been described N^o. 3.; we must not however conclude that the same MS. has been quoted under three different names, though Wettstein assigned, in his catalogue of MSS. in the third part, Vol. II. p. 452. 454. two different numbers, 22. and 58. to that MS. of the Acts and the Epistles which belonged to Dr. Mead, and was afterwards purchased by Dr. Askew, probably because he did not know that they were one and the same MS. Our author's two-fold reference to N^o. 3. is occasioned by the circumstance, that the two MSS. here described by the names of Cod. Meadi 1, and Cod. Meadi 3. the one containing the Gospels, the other the Acts and the Epistles, were supposed by Dr. Askew, who was in possession of both, to be parts of one and the same whole, both of which therefore our author mentions N^o. 3. though that article relates properly to the latter alone. The Codices Meadi 1. and 3. which were purchased by Dr. Askew, are now in the British Museum. See Note 40. The Codex Meadi 2. which is an Evangelistarium, was likewise purchased by Dr. Askew, from whose hands it came into those of Mademoiselle d'Eon, who offered it a short time ago for sale, but not being able to get the price she expected, which was fifty guineas, she has packed it up, with an intent to send it to France.

sisting of two volumes of the 12mo. size. In the first volume, at the bottom of the first page, is written, Cæsaris de Missy Berolinensis, A. D. 1748. No extracts have been given of this manuscript in any edition of the Greek Testament, unless it has been collated and quoted by some different name, before it came into the hands of de Missy. The two manuscripts of Cesar de Missy, which our author describes N°. 177, 178. and which he says were purchased by Dr. Hunter, will be deposited with the rest of Dr. Hunter's manuscripts in Glasgow Library.

PAGE 281.

215. The literary life of Cesar de Missy is described p. 601—604. of Nichols's anecdotes of Bowyer, Lond. 1782, 4to. The account is chiefly taken from the *Gazette littéraire de Berlin*, 19th. and 26th. Feb. 1778.

CODEX MOLSHHEIMENSIS.

PAGE 284.

216. But he would have equally omitted to quote this manuscript if the reading had been *os*, since the reading of the Vulgate is 'quod.' His silence therefore on this occasion leaves it wholly undetermined, whether the Cod. Molsheimensis has *os* or *Θεος*.

CODEX MONTFORTIANUS.

217. That this manuscript is written on paper, not on vellum, as some have supposed, is confirmed by the account communicated to Professor Bruns by the present Bishop of Waterford, and printed in the third volume of the *Repertorium*. It appears likewise from this account, that the manuscript is of the duodecimo size.

218. Our author here reviews Travis's Letters to Gibbon, and combats the arguments which are there alleged in favour of 1 John v. 7. especially those which
are

are grounded on the authority of the two modern manuscripts, the Montfortianus and Ravianus.

PAGE 285.

219. As this manuscript is one of the two pillars, which support the celebrated verse in the first epistle of St. John, it would be of some importance in sacred criticism, if we could trace it to its source. We know the names of five of its proprietors, who probably wrote their names at the beginning of the manuscript, which enabled Usher, the last proprietor, before it came to Trinity College, Dublin, to mention them in the London Polyglot. Montfort, who possessed it before Usher, and from whom the MS. takes its name, because it belonged to him, when it was collated for the London Polyglot, was a Doctor of Divinity at Cambridge in the middle of the last century. William Charc, or Chark, possessed it before Dr. Montfort. In a manuscript collation of the Codex Montfortianus, which is now preserved in Emmanuel Library in Cambridge, and is perhaps that which was made for the London Polyglot, the name is written Charc; but a line is drawn under it, seemingly by a different hand, and Clark is written in the margin, which, in the catalogue of manuscripts prefixed to the Var. lect. N. T. in the sixth volume of the London Polyglot, is converted into Clerk. But Mill, who probably saw this manuscript collation, has written Charc. He likewise speaks of him, as a person well known, for he says, in his Prol. § 1376. *Codicis cum in corpore, tum præsertim in spatio marginali plurima notavit eruditus quispiam: Gul. Charcus ut opinor, erat enim is in Græcis insigniter versatus, &c.* And in the new Annual Register for 1792, History of Knowledge, p. xxi. William Chark is mentioned as a distinguished scholar in Queen Elizabeth's time. He is probably the same William Chark, who was of Peter House, and was expelled the University for heresy in 1572. Thomas Clement, who possessed it before Charc, is perhaps the person, of whom Arias Montanus speaks in his preface to the first volume

volume of the Antwerp Polyglot, dated 1569, 'Est etiam nobis a Clemente Anglo, Philosophiæ et Medicinæ Doctore,' &c. Froy therefore, the Franciscan friar, must have possessed it either about, or before the middle of the sixteenth century: a few years previous to which, that is, between 1519 and 1522, it was known to Erasmus, by the name of Codex Britannicus. We can ascend no higher in the history of this manuscript, as we have no further data: but it is probable that we have nearly reached the time of its origin, since there is reason to believe that it was written only a few years before the last mentioned period. See the latter part of Note 224.

220. But the very strongest proof is, that the text of the third edition of Erasmus, printed in 1522, differs in this interpolated passage from all other editions, except those which were immediately copied from it, and at the same time agrees word for word with the Codex Montfortianus. As the edition of Complutum, the third edition of Erasmus, and the third edition of R. Stephens, are the three cardinal editions, from which most others have been formed, and are themselves difficult to be procured, I will transcribe from all three the interpolated words, and compare them with those of the Codex Montfortianus.

Editio Complutensis, anni 1514.

εν τῷ θρανῷ, ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Codex Montfortianus.

εν τῷ θρανῷ, πατήρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ ὅτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ.

Editio Erasmi tertia, anni 1522.

εν τῷ θρανῷ, πατήρ, λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ ὅτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ.

Editio Stephani tertia, anni 1550.

ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ
 εἶσι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ.

It is evident therefore, that the Codex Britannicus Erasmi, and the Codex Montfortianus, are one and the same manuscript. Erasmus has given an exact transcript, which Stephens (or rather Erasmus himself, in his two last editions) has modelled into better Greek by the insertion of the article, in imitation of the Complutensian editors. If further proof were required, that the Codex Montfortianus and the Codex Britannicus Erasmi are one and the same manuscript, it might be added, that Erasmus, in his *Apologia ad Jacobum Stunicam*, which was first printed at Paris in 1522, and re-printed in 1540, in the last volume of the Basel edition of Erasmus's works, p. 238—296. has given a transcript not only of the seventh, but of the eighth, and a part of the ninth verse, from the Codex Britannicus, and the whole passage, though it differs from the common printed text, agrees word for word with the text of the Codex Montfortianus, except in the omission of the word ἅγιον, and of the article οἱ before μαρτυροῦντες, which are clearly typographical errors, because they are *not* wanting in his third edition of the Greek Testament, printed in the same year as his *Apology to Stunica*, and before Erasmus had seen the Complutensian edition, and because he expressly declares that 1 John v. 7. as it stands in the third edition of his Greek Testament, was taken from the Codex Britannicus. Compare the last volume of the Basel edition of Erasmus's works, p. 295. with the fac simile of 1 John v. 6, 7, 8, 9. in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, Vol. III. p. 260. Whether the two typographical errors above-mentioned, on which so much stress has lately been laid, are likewise observable in the original edition of the *Apologia ad Stunicam*, I know not, as I have never been able to procure it. Erasmus in his observations on 1 John v. 7. in his edition of

1527, draws a parallel between this passage of the Codex Britannicus and the Complutensian edition: but he takes no notice of any difference in respect to ω and $\omega\gamma\iota\omega$.

221. It is neither the business of the translator, nor suitable to the present design, to enter into the disputes, to which our author here alludes. It is sufficient to observe, that the controversy relative to the Complutum edition, which some years ago divided the literati in Germany, was conducted principally by Semler, Professor of Divinity in Halle, on the one side, and Goeze, a clergyman in Hamburg, on the other. A list of the principal publications, which appeared on this occasion, may be seen in the 17th. Note to chap. xii. sect 1. The hint, in regard to moderation and impartiality, is inapplicable to Semler, whose moderate and tolerant principles are universally known.

PAGE 286.

222. It appears from the fac simile of this passage, published in the Repertorium, Vol. III p. 260. that in the words $\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, the diphthong $\epsilon\iota$ is denoted by a figure resembling a q , which abbreviation is likewise used in the Codex Regius 2930. written in the year 1124, of which Montfaucon has given a specimen in his Palæographia Græca, p. 308. and which he has described p. 303. But as this same abbreviation is likewise found in the most modern manuscripts, as appears from the specimen given in Montfaucon's Palæographia, p. 333. it affords no proof of antiquity. With respect to the dots over the Iota and the Ypsilon, from which an argument has been drawn in favour of its antiquity, because Montfaucon, in his Palæographia, p. 33. had said these dots were in use a thousand years ago, it may be observed, that they are used likewise in the most modern manuscripts, (Palæographia, p. 324, 333.) and are therefore no proof of antiquity. On the contrary, these very dots may be used as an argument, to prove that the Cod. Montfortianus is very modern. For though

Montfaucon refers to two manuscripts in uncial letters, in which these dots are sometimes added over *ι* and *υ*, and they are found in the Alexandrinus, and Cantabrigienſis, yet of all the ſpecimens which he has given p. 270—300. of manuſcripts written in ſmall letters, from the firſt introduction of theſe letters, not one before the twelfth century has thoſe dots. See p. 301. of the Palæographia, where a manuſcript written in the twelfth century has them ſometimes on the *ι*, but never on the *υ*. But manuſcripts written in the fourteenth century, of which he has given ſpecimens, p. 320, 333. have theſe dots on both letters; but not in all caſes. Now as theſe letters are dotted always in the Codex Montfortianus, but not always in the manuſcripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and ſtill leſs often in thoſe of the twelfth century, we may infer that the Codex Montfortianus is at leaſt as modern as the fifteenth century.

223. It ſeems then that he adhered more ſtrictly to the Latin, and conſequently wrote worſe Greek, than the perſon who tranſlated the paſſage, as it ſtands in the Complutum edition.

224. It muſt here be obſerved, that our author has quoted from the Cod. Mont. the ſeventh and eighth verſes complete, but as he has neglected to mention it, a doubt might ariſe, whether the clause *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν*, at the end of the eighth verſe, were not there, as well as the ſimilar clause at the end of the ſeventh. But that it is really omitted, appears from the fac ſimile mentioned in the preceding note, becauſe it repreſents alſo a part of the ninth verſe, and immediately after *ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα*, follow *εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν, κ. τ. λ.*

To the arguments which have been uſed by our author, to ſhew that the writer of the Cod. Montfortianus tranſlated this paſſage from the Latin, though they are ſufficiently convincing, may be added, that he has altered *πνεῦμα*, in the ſixth verſe, (as appears from the fac ſimile in the Repertorium, and likewiſe from a collation which I have procured from Dublin) to *χρεῖσες*, becauſe Chriſtus
is

is the reading of the Vulgate, though it is found in no Greek MS. It is an alteration which could not have taken place in a Greek manuscript, but by design: for though *Christus* might be written for *Spiritus* by mistake, since these two words were abbreviated in the old Latin manuscripts \overline{XPS} and \overline{SPS} , (Pref. to Casley's Catalogue, p. 22, 23.) yet the Greek abbreviations of $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha$ are too different to admit of an accidental exchange. The article likewise is omitted before $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, so that, instead of the common reading $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\varsigma\iota\nu\ \eta\ \alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, the Cod. Mont. has $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\varsigma\iota\nu\ \alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, which is manifestly a bald translation of the Vulgate, 'Christus est veritas.' Another remarkable circumstance relative to this MS. is, that in the division of the text into chapters, the Latin arrangement is observed, though at the same time the $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\alpha$ of Eusebius are noted. See the Cat. of MSS. prefixed to the Var. Lect. N. T. in the sixth volume of the London Polyglot. Now the Latin arrangement, which was introduced by Hugo de S. Caro in the thirteenth century, and which is that of our printed Bibles, though observed in the modern manuscripts of the Vulgate, was in general not admitted into the Greek manuscripts, which adhered to the $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\alpha$ of Eusebius. Its admission therefore into the Codex Montfortii, not only shews what influence the Vulgate has had on this manuscript, but proves at the same time, independently of other arguments, that the Cod. Montfortii is very modern. For no Greek MS. is known, in which the text is divided into our present chapters, that was written before the fifteenth century; when the Greeks, who fled from their own country into the West of Europe, became transcribers for members of the Latin church, and of course adopted the Latin divisions. I have myself seen two of this kind, in the University Library of Cambridge, marked Hh, 6, 12. and Ll, 2, 13. The two first are badly written, on modern paper, and in the most modern hand: and the last has a subscription which imports that it was written at Paris, by Jerom of Sparta, who died at the beginning of the 16th. century.

225. The omission of the clause *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἶσι* at the end of the eighth verse, is a proof, not only that the writer of the Codex Montfortianus copied from the Vulgate, because no ancient Greek manuscript omits the clause in that place, but that he copied even from modern transcripts of the Vulgate, because this final clause is found in all the manuscripts of the Vulgate written before the thirteenth century. It is also wanting in the Latin text of the Complutum edition, and for that reason this clause is there likewise omitted in the Greek. Yet there is no reason to suppose that the Cod. Montfortianus, like the Cod. Ravianus, is a copy of the Complutum edition, for the Comp. has *τὸ πνεῦμα* in the sixth verse, the Montf. *χρῖστος*; in the seventh verse the Comp. has *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, the Montf. *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, the Compl. *ὁ πατήρ*, &c. the Montf. *πατήρ*, &c. without the article; the Comp. has *οἱ τρεῖς*, the Montf. *οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς*.

CODICES MORI.

PAGE 287.

Most of the manuscripts belonging to Bishop Moore (not More, as our author writes it) are described in the Catalog. Lib. MSS. Angliæ, et Hiberniæ. Tom. II. P. I. p. 361—378.

226. It is now marked in the University Library Dd, 9, 69. It has the Ammonian sections without references to the canons of Eusebius.

227. It is now marked in the University Library Dd, 8, 49. It was probably brought from the East, for immediately above the first lesson is an Arabic word *انجيل روي*, which was meant perhaps to express Evangelium.

CODICES MOSQUENSES.

PAGE 288.

228. They were published in 1788, a few months after our author's Introduction to the N. T.

229. As

229. As this work is now complete, the two last volumes having been published in 1788, and the learned editor has given no general description of the MSS. which he had used, I am unable to supply, what our author was obliged to omit. But as the edition of Matthäi is of real importance, I will subjoin the following table, taken from the Preface to the Epistles to the Corinthians, in which I have added to each manuscript, such short accounts as I have been able to select from scattered parts of the work, the table itself being a mere classification, without any description whatsoever. It must be observed, that the figures here prefixed to them, serve only to number them in the present catalogue, but have no reference to the work itself, where the manuscripts are constantly quoted by those letters, which here follow the word Codex.

CLASS I.

MSS. of the whole N. T.

1. Codex k, very neatly and accurately written on vellum, in the eleventh century. See Pref. to the Cath. Epist. p. 24.

2. Codex l, very accurately written in small letters, in the twelfth century. Ib. p. 25.

CLASS II.

Euchologia, or Lectionaria, of the whole N. T. except the Revelation.

3—6. Codices ξ, χ, ψ, ω. The last is described in the Pref. to the Acts, p. 14.

CLASS III.

MSS of the four Gospels.

7. Codex v, written in uncial letters.

8—13. Codices o, p, q, r, x, z, written in small letters.

14—18. Codices a, d, 10, i, n, accompanied with scholia, or commentaries.

CLASS IV.

Evangelitaria.

19—20. Codd. h, b, written in uncial letters.

21—23. f, c, t, in small letters.

CLASS V.

MSS. of one, or more, but not of all the Gospels.

24. Cod. e, containing St. Matthew and St. Mark, with a commentary.

25. Cod. g, containing St. Luke and St. John, and a fragment of St. Mark, with a commentary.

26. Cod. 11, a MS. of St. Luke and St. John, with a commentary.

27. Cod. m, a MS. of St. Matthew and St. Luke, with the Scholia of Theophylact.

28. Codex s, a MS. of St. John, with a catena.

29. Codex 15, a fragment of St. John, with scholia.

N. B. I here omit the sixth, seventh, and eighth classes, because they contain only commentaries; they cannot therefore be considered as a supplement to our author's catalogue, which relates only to manuscripts of the text of the Greek Testament, though they are properly placed in that of Matthäi, as being one of the many sources, from which he has derived his various readings.

CLASS IX.

MSS. containing the Acts, and the Epistles.

30. Codex a, consists of three parts. 1. Lessons from the Acts. 2. The text of all the Epistles. 3. Lessons from the Acts and the Epistles for every day in the whole year. When this manuscript is quoted among the various

rious readings, its three parts are distinguished by a¹, a², a³. It is very neatly written on vellum, either in the tenth or eleventh century. Pref. to the Cath. Epist. p. 28.

31. Codex c, written on paper, in the fifteenth century, but not accurately. Pref. to the Catholic Epistles, p. 26.

32. Codex d, written on vellum in the eleventh century. Pref. to the Cath. Epist. p. 25.

33. Codex f, written on cotton paper in the thirteenth century. It has many remarkable readings, but in the Epistles of St. Paul, which were written by a different copyist, they are of less value. Ib.

34. Codex m, written on vellum, in the eleventh century. It is written with great accuracy, and has some few corrections, but from the same hand. Ib. p. 24.

CLASS X.

Lectionaria of the Acts and Epistles.

35. Codex b, a MS. written on vellum, in the tenth century. It has lessons from the Acts, and all the Epistles. Ib. p. 24.

36. Codex e, written on vellum, in the twelfth century. It has lessons only from the Acts. Ib. p. 25.

Codd. a¹, and a³, have been enumerated Class ix.

CLASS XI.

MSS. of all the Epistles.

37. Codex g, written on vellum, in the ninth century, with a catena and scholia. The text is written in uncial letters, but the commentaries in small letters. Ib. p. 23, 24.

CLASS XII.

MSS. of all the Epistles of St. Paul.

38. Codex n. It contains also the scholia of the Pseudo-Æcumenius.

CLASS XIII.

MSS. of one, or more, but not all the Epistles of St. Paul.

39. Codex q, a MS. of the Epistle to the Romans, with the scholia of the Pseudo-Theophylact.

40. Codex i, a MS. of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, with the scholia of the Pseudo-Theophylact.

N. B. I here omit the fourteenth Class, for the same reason as before.

CLASS XV.

MSS. of the Revelation.

41. Codex o. It is accompanied with a commentary of Andreas Cæsareensis, and has some various readings noted in the margin. Pref. to the Revelation, p. 3.

42, 43. Codices p, r.

CLASS XVI.

MSS. of lessons from the catholic epistles.

44. Codex tz, a manuscript written on vellum, in 1116. Pref. to the Cath. Ep. p. 27.

A list of the Moscow manuscripts in general is given in the two following publications, by the same author. Notitia Codd. MStorum Mosquensium, Mosquæ 1776, fol. and Index Codd. MStorum Græcorum bibliothecarum Mosquensium, Petropoli 1780. It appears also from his Preface to St. Mark, p. 35. that he intends to publish a critical description of all his manuscripts of the Greek Testament.

Lastly, it may be observed, that beside the classification already given, which is grounded on the contents only of the manuscripts, the learned editor, in his Preface to St. Matthew's Gospel, has arranged them under three heads, in reference to their critical authority.

1. Codices textus perpetui sine scholiis, 2. Codices lectiona-

lectionariorum. 3. Codices textus perpetui cum commentariis et scholiis. The value of a reading he estimates, cæteris paribus, according to this gradation.

N. B. Since the first edition of these Notes were printed, Griesbach has given a very clear and distinct catalogue of the Moscow manuscripts in the second edition of his Greek Testament.

CODEx NANIANUS.

PAGE 289.

230. In bibliotheca equitis Nanii codex asservatur caractere unciali exaratus sæculo x. vel xi. complectens quatuor evangelia cum Eusebii canonibus. Birch Prolegomena, p. 56. This manuscript was collated by Dr. Münster, and its extracts are inserted in Birch's Greek Testament. It is likewise described in the following catalogue: Græci codices manuscripti apud Nanios Patricios Venetos asservati, Bononiæ, 1784, 4to.

CODEx NORIMBERGENSIS.

The work to which our author refers, for a description of this manuscript, which has not been quoted in any edition of the Greek Testament, is entitled, Das Altdorfsche literärische Museum: but a Latin description of it may be seen in the following work, C. F. de Murr Memorabilia bibliothecarum publicarum Norimbergensium, et Universitatis Altorfinæ. Norimbergæ, 1786—1788, 2 tom. 8vo.

CODICES COLLEGII NOVI.

PAGE 290.

231. The mistakes are not wholly to be ascribed to Mill. In his original edition, printed at Oxford in 1707, the following account is given of these manuscripts in the Index to the Prolegomena. N. 1. Evangelia in Collegio Novo, p. 149. 155. Actus et Epistolæ, ibid. N. 2. Actus et Epistolæ in Collegio Novo, p. 150.

150. 155. It is therefore evident that Mill's Codex N. 1. or Nov. 1. includes the first-mentioned manuscript of the Acts and the Epistles, as well as that of the Gospels. But in Küster's edition of Mill's Greek Testament, owing to some typographical error, the words 'Actus et Epistolæ,' belonging to N. 1. are omitted, which edition being used by our author, he ascribes the inaccuracy to Mill himself. But it is extraordinary that he has not discovered the error, from the very words which he has quoted, for as Mill, among his various readings, quotes only N. 1. and N. 2. and the N. 1. is quoted in the Acts and Epistles, as well as in the Gospels, he might have reasonably supposed, notwithstanding the omission in Küster, that it included two of those described in this paragraph of our author's Introduction.

232. Our author describes this manuscript as containing the Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul alone, but it contains likewise the catholic epistles, as appears from Mill's Prolegomena, § 1423. and Wettstein's Prolegomena to the third part, Vol. II. p. 453. Mill has even quoted it in the catholic epistles, where we find both N. 1. and N. 2.

PAGE 291.

233. By some extraordinary accident, the marks N°. 1. and N. 2. have been inverted in the Epistles, for N. 2. is quoted in the Epistles of St. Paul, whereas N. 2. in the Polyglot, denotes a manuscript containing only the Acts and the catholic epistles. But the following statement of these three manuscripts, in New College in Oxford, will set the matter in a clear light, and shew at one view the marks, by which they are noted in Wettstein, Mill, and the London Polyglot.

MS. of the Gospels { Cod. 58. in Wettstein P. I.—Nov.
1. in Mill.—Nov. I. in Pol.

MS. of the Acts } Cod. 43. in Wettstein P. II.—Nov.
and all the Epistles. } 2. in Mill.—Nov. 1. in Pol.

MS.

MS. of the Acts } Cod. 36. in Wetst. P. III.—Nov.
and the cath. epist. } 1. in Mill.—Nov. 2. in Pol.

CODÆX PARRHASII.

234. The most copious extracts from this manuscript are those which have been lately given by Alter in the first volume of his Greek Testament, p. 477—527. The name which he ascribes to it is that which it bears at present in the Vienna catalogue; but though he calls it not Cod. Parrhasii, it is evidently the same, as appears from his Note, p. 477. in which he refers to Treschow's Tentamen, p. 22. where the Cod. Parrhasii is described. A fac simile of its characters is given in the third plate annexed to Treschow's Tentamen. Montfaucon, in his *Diarium Italicum*, p. 308. refers it to the eleventh century. He has quoted one reading from it, Matth. i. 11. *Ἰωάννης δὲ ἐγγενήσῃ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, Ἰωάννης δὲ ἐγγενήσῃ τοῦ Ἰεσοῦ*, &c. and it is probably on account of this reading that Wetstein assigned to this MS. a place in his catalogue, though he has neglected to quote it in the place in question. Montfaucon in the same page mentions another manuscript of the Gospels, preserved in the same library of S. Johannes de Carbonaria in Naples, written with uncial letters in the seventh or eighth century. This is the MS. which Le Long means in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 176. where he refers to the *Diarium Italicum*, p. 308.

CODÆX PASSIONEI.

235. This manuscript, which took its name from Cardinal Passionei, its proprietor, is described in Blanchini *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, P. I. p. 564, 565. and in the plate annexed to p. 559. is given a fac simile of its characters. It is written in uncial letters, but with accents, and marks of aspiration. Montfaucon likewise in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 514. has given a fac simile of its characters.

CODÆX

CODEX PERRONIANUS.

236. This manuscript is so called from its former proprietor Cardinal Perronio. See Mill's Prolegomena, § 1506. Montfaucon, in his *Diarium Italicum*, p. 308. says of it, *Codex decimi sæculi egregiæ notæ, qui cum olim Cardinalis Perronii fuisset, jam in bibliotheca S. Taurini Ebroicensis conspicitur.*

CODICES PETAVIANI.

PAGE 292.

237. The manuscripts, which formerly belonged to Petavius, or, according to his French name, Peteau, were purchased, if not all, at least the greatest part of them, by Queen Christina of Sweden. Our author relates that the first of the three Codices Petaviani, of which extracts have been given by Mill and Wetstein, was presented to Vossius, and that it is now in the University library at Leyden, and marked 77. He should have added that it is marked 77 among the Greek quarto MSS. which belonged to Vossius. See p. 399. of the *Catalogus bibliothecæ Lugduno-Batavæ*, 1716, folio. Of the Petavianus 3. Wetstein relates that, after the death of Queen Christina, it came into the Vatican with the rest of her manuscripts. Of these a catalogue is given in Montfaucon *Bibl. bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 14—61. and of Peteau's manuscripts in particular, p. 61—97. With respect to the Petavianus 2. Wetstein does not mention where it is preserved at present, nor have I found any manuscript, in the two catalogues given by Montfaucon, which corresponds to Mill's description of it.

238. It is evident from Wetstein's quotation that they are not omitted.

CODEX RAVIANUS.

PAGE 294.

239. Whoever compares the *fac simile* of the Cod. Ravianus, published by Treschow, with the Compluten-
sian

sian edition, will find the resemblance to be such, that, unless he were informed that it was taken from the former, he would conclude it to be a fac simile of the latter.

PAGE 295.

240. The German title of this work is, Semlers historische und critische Sammlungen über die so genannten Beweisstellen in der Dogmatik. Halle 1764. 1768, 2 vols. 12mo. In the page to which our author refers, La Croze expresses himself in the following manner: Qui codicem editum Complutensem vidit, is vidit et manuscriptum codicem nostrum; ne demtis quidem mendis typographorum, quæ scriba indoctus ita fideliter expressit, ut omnino constet hominem illiteratum ab erudito aliquo nebulone ei fraudi perficiendæ fuisse præfatum. Et sane pro antiquo liber ille venditus est, immani etiam pretio, etsi membranæ recenti adhuc calx sive creta illa adhæreat, quæ pellibus vitulinis parandis adhiberi solet; atramentum ubique albicans, demtis aliis criteriis, fraudi agnoscendæ sufficeret. Quicumque ergo ad hunc codicem provocat, is omnino se nihil agere norit. Certe quod ad me attinet, pertinax sum fidei Nicænæ et orthodoxæ, at illi tuendæ absit ut fraudes unquam adhibeam.

241. See Note 221.

PAGE 296.

242. Its German title is, Untersuchung der Ravischen Griechischen Handschrift des Neuen Testaments, von G. G. Pappelbaum. Berlin 1785, 8vo.

243. If, in order to evade this argument, as well as that, which is drawn from the similarity of the letters, it should be contended that the Codex Ravianus was one of the manuscripts used by the Complutensian editors, that they cast their types in imitation of its letters, and that the coincidence even in places, where the Complutensian edition is said to have errors of the press, arose from a cause directly contrary to that, which is assigned by La Groze, Griesbach, Michaelis, &c. namely, that the errors in the Cod. Ravianus are nothing more than errors
of

of the pen, made by the transcriber, and that the supposed errors of the press in the Complutensian edition arose merely from a too servile adherence to the manuscript which the editors principally used, we may reply, 1. That though no editor, however learned or accurate, is free from the danger of mistakes, that arise from accident, it is wholly inconceivable how the Spanish editors, who were men of learning, could copy manifest errata by design. 2. That, as the Codex Ravianus contains the disputed passage, 1 John v. 7. *Stunica* would infallibly have appealed to it, when publicly challenged by Erasmus, if any such manuscript had been known to him. See Simon *Dissertation critique sur les manuscrits du Nouveau Testament*, p. 98.

PAGE 297.

244. For that reason the translator will be excused in giving no extracts from those parts of the *Orient. Bibl.* to which our author refers; and this is the less necessary, since Mr. Porson's publication in 1790.

CODICES REGII.

The *Codices Regii* are described in the *Catalogus Librorum MStorum Bibl. Regiæ*, Tom. II. p. 12—47. In this Catalogue they are arranged according to the new numbers. A catalogue of them, arranged according to the old numbers, is given in *Montfaucon Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 709—895.

PAGE 298.

245. Simon calls this manuscript *Recueil de Peres Grecs sur les quatre Evangiles*. See his *Histoire critique du Texte du N. T.* ch. xiii. p. 146. Our author, in his note (m), says that M. Fleischer was unable to find the N°. 1869. by which Simon quotes this manuscript. It is perhaps an erratum; for Montfaucon, who in his *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 709—895. has given a catalogue of the MSS. in the royal library, arranged

ranged according to the old numbers, has mentioned no manuscript with this number, but proceeds immediately from 1863 to 1871. See p. 726. of the above-quoted work, from which it appears that 1869 may be an erratum for 1879, or 1896.

PAGE 299.

246. I have not ventured to alter this sentence, though it has evidently many errata. The occasion which our author means is the story of the adulteress, John viii. but this is not p. 148. but p. 890. and the Codices Regii, which Wetstein there quotes, beside the manuscript in question, are not 1884. and 2863. but 2224. 2858. 2868. 1869. 2375. 2242. 2867. 3424. But our author is not mistaken in saying that Wetstein has quoted MSS. on John viii. which he has not taken into his Catalogue, for the Codd. 2224. 2858. 2375. are not enumerated in the Prolegomena.

247. There are several inaccuracies in the description of this manuscript; it differs at least from the account given in the Catalogus MStorum Bibl. Regiæ, Tom. II. p. 13.

248. Ib. p. 30. This MS. is there referred to the eleventh century, and is related to have been brought from the East in 1669.

249. Either Wetstein's description of this manuscript is inaccurate, or that of the editors of the Paris Catalogue, Vol. II. p. 34. Wetstein describes it as containing the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation, with the Prologues of Euthalius, and Scholia by Œcumenius, and other commentators: the editors of the Paris Catalogue as containing commentaries on the above-mentioned books without the text, though it is added, in respect to the Acts, *accessit pars sacri contextus manu recentiore in marginibus scripta*; but no mention is made of the text of the Epistles or Revelation, though on other occasions, where a catena or commentary is accompanied with the text, they have not failed to note it. Montfaucon likewise, in his *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 726. de-

scribes it, as follows : Codex 1886. Græcus, x. sæculi, Expositiones in Acta Apostolorum, et in Epistolas Pauli. The identity of the manuscript is ascertained by the following subscription, quoted both in Wetstein, and the Paris Catalogue : Hunc librum dono dedit Janus Lascaris Græcus, vir ut integerrimus ita doctissimus mihi Petro Merieli Constantiensi decimâ Januarii, anno ab incarnatione Domini 1518. Montfaucon refers this MS. to the tenth century. He has given a specimen of its characters, p. 283. of his *Palæographia*, from which it appears that the MS. has a very great number of abbreviations.

Another Codex Regius 1886. distinguished by the addition of the figure 2 (1886²) has been collated by Griesbach. It is a manuscript of all the epistles written in the twelfth century, is noted at present 60. in the royal library, and is described in the *Catalogus librorum MStorum Bibliothecæ Regiæ*, Tom. II. p. 14. It is noted by Griesbach 65. in the epistles of St. Paul, and 62. in the catholic epistles.

PAGE 300.

250. Wetstein was certainly mistaken in describing the manuscript, which he has noted 18. in the first part of his N. T. as the Codex Regius 2241.; for he expressly says that he copied from Simon, and that it is one of the manuscripts, which Simon quotes, in treating of the story of the adulteress, in the eighth chapter of St. John. See Simon *Hist. crit. du Texte du N. T.* ch. xiii. Now as Simon quotes no manuscript belonging to the royal library with this number, it is certain that 2241. is an erratum in Wetstein's *Prolegomena*, either of the writer, or of the printer; but our author's conjecture, that it is an erratum for 2441. which would be highly probable, had Simon quoted a manuscript with this number, is without foundation, because no such number appears in Simon's list. The four manuscripts, which Wetstein enumerates in his *Prolegomena*, p. 47. as taken from Simon, are those which were formerly marked in the royal library (according to Wetstein) 2241. 1869. 1883. 2860. The three last numbers I have found in Simon: the first therefore, which is the number in question,

tion, must be an erratum for one of the other numbers quoted by Simon, which are 1884. 2401. 2863. 2868. The number 2401. comes the nearest to that in question; and it appears from Montfaucon *Bibl. Bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 732. that this MS. was a Commentary on the four Gospels.

251. This description agrees with that of the printed catalogue, except that the MS. contains also the Psalms and the Canticles. See the *Catalogus MStorum Bibl. Regiæ*, Tom. II. p. 12, 13.

252. Tom. I. p. 371, 372. ed. Boerner. That which our author quotes is the Paris edition of 1723. which edition is always understood in these Notes, when no other is specified.

PAGE 301.

253. Nor have the difficulties with which this manuscript is attended been cleared up in the preceding description. Our author describes it as containing the whole N. T. except the Revelation, and says that it is marked at present in the royal library 49. which cannot possibly be true, for that manuscript contains the Gospels alone. See the *Cat. MSS. B. R.* Tom. II. p. 13. Wetstein describes his Codex 8. in the first part, as Cod. Stephani ζ, or Codex Regius 2242. a manuscript of the Gospels; and his Codex 8. in the second part, likewise as Cod. Stephani ζ, but as Cod. Regius 2241. a manuscript of the Acts and the Epistles. Now 2241. is in this instance an evident erratum in Wetstein for 2242. and the whole confusion has been occasioned by Wetstein's dividing the Codex Regius 2242. into two parts, mentioning the Gospels only, in the Prolegomena to the first part of his N. T. the Acts, and Epistles only, in the Prolegomena to the second; and by making an erratum in the second instance in regard to the number. The Codex Regius 2242. described by Le Long, p. 178. and there said to be the same as the Codex Stephani ζ, is now marked, not 49. as our author says, but 47. as appears from comparing Le Long's description in the *Bibl. sacra*,

with that which is given in the Paris Catalogue. Le Long describes this manuscript in the *Journal des Sçavans*, Vol. LXVII. p. 650. as follows, Codex ζ. Les 4. Evangiles, les Epitres de St. Paul, celles de St. Jacques, de Saint Pierre, et la premiere de St. Jean. Manuscrit du Roi 2242. He gives the very same description in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 208. The question might have been determined with still greater certainty, if Montfaucon had described this manuscript in his *Bibl. bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 730. But he says only of the *Codd. Regii* 2240, 2241, 2242. *Libri sacre scripturæ Veteris et Novi Testamenti*.

254. Wetstein's Codex M, (which, according to Le Long, was formerly noted 2243. in the royal library) is at present noted 48. not 51. as our author relates on the authority of Mr. Fleischer. The description which Wetstein gives of his Codex M is, *Cod. Bibl. Reg. 2243. quem Franciscus de Camps Abbas de Signi obtulit, continet 4. evangelia*. The description given in the Paris Catalogue, Vol. II. p. 13. of the manuscript noted at present 48. is, *Codex membranaceus a Domino Francisco de Camps Ludovico XIV. oblatus, quo continentur evangelia quatuor*. It appears therefore that they are one and the same manuscript, whereas Codex 51. is described as having belonged to Du Fresne. Mr. Fleischer's mistake was probably occasioned by the following circumstance. Not only the Codex de Camps, but likewise another manuscript of the Gospels, was noted by the same number 2243. (Le Long *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 176. 178.), and the Codex de Camps was distinguished by the addition of the figure 2. viz. 2243². as appears from Montfaucon, *Bibl. bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 730. These two manuscripts Mr. Fleischer confounded, and assigned therefore a number to the one, which belongs to the other.

The Codex de Camps is described by Montfaucon in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 260, 261. where a fac simile is given of its characters. He says, that if he judged from the characters used in the text of this manuscript, he should conclude that it was written in the ninth century ;
but

but as the same characters are found likewise in manuscripts of the tenth century, and various readings are noted in several parts of the Codex de Camps, written 'primâ ut videtur manu, uno ductu et continuatis literis,' he concludes that this manuscript was written in the tenth century.

PAGE 302.

255. With this difference, that according to Griesbach the additional mark of distinction is a letter, not a cypher, Wettstein's Codex 13. being marked by Griesbach Reg. 2244^b. See his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. cliv. Le Long, in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 178. 180. distinguishes them neither by the addition of a figure, nor of a letter, though in other cases his mark of distinction is a figure, which is likewise used in Montfaucon's Catalogue in the *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*.

256. Griesbach, in his *Symbolæ*, p. cliv. describes it as follows, Codex 13. quondam Telleriano-Rhemensis 56. deinde Regius 2244^b. nunc Regius 50. (non 55. ut tradit Cl. Fleischerus) Küstero Parisinus 6. quadratæ formæ iv. Evangelia continens. He then enumerates the chasms, which have been quoted by our author. These chasms were first observed by Griesbach; for, if we except that at the beginning of the manuscript, they are unnoticed both by Küster in his Preface to his edition of Mill's Greek Testament, and by the editors of the Paris Catalogue.

PAGE 303.

257. Wettstein is not silent on this subject, for he says expressly of his Codex 17. in the first part, *Continet quatuor evangelia Græce cum adjuncta Latina Vulgata versione*. Proleg. p. 47. Le Long, in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 180. relates, that it was written in France by George Jeron of Sparta, who was Professor in the University of Paris at the end of the fifteenth century, and preceptor in the Greek language to Reuchlin and Budæus. According to the description in the Catal.

MSS. Bibl. Reg. Tom. II. p. 13. it formerly belonged to the Cardinal of Bourbon.

PAGE 304.

258. If Wettstein's Codex 51. in the third part of his N. T. which he describes as the Codex Regius 2248. is the same as that which is now marked 56. Wettstein was mistaken in calling it an octavo, for Codex 56. is enumerated in the Paris catalogue among the folios. In this manuscript, the five last verses only are wanting in the book of Revelation, not the eight last, as Mr. Fleischer says. See the Catalogus MStorum Bibl. Regiæ, Tom. II. p. 14.

259. Also from the description given of it in the Catalogus MStorum Bibl. Regiæ, Tom. II. p. 14.

260. An abstract from those parts of the Orient. Bibl. is unnecessary, because complete information may be had in the Symbolæ Criticæ.

PAGE 305.

261. There is no reason to suppose that the Codex Stephani α , was one of those manuscripts, which were collated at Alexandria in the seventh century: but the examples, which Dr. Ridley has selected from this manuscript, are too few to lead to any absolute decision. See his *Dissertatio de vers. Syr. sect. 15. p. 63.* Adler, however, has brought the matter to a certainty: for on an accurate collation of all the marginal readings of the Philoxenian version, in the four Gospels, he found only two, which were peculiar to the Codex Stephani α . See his *Vers. Syriacæ*, p. 130.

With respect to the antiquity of this manuscript, see Simon *Dissertation critique sur les MSS. du N. T. p. 66.* where he refers it to the ninth century. He relates, that it is written with accents, though in uncial letters. The same account is given by Griesbach in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. lxxvii. But Griesbach adds, that accents are not placed on every word, and besides, that they are frequently placed wrong. From the oblong form of the letters

letters he judges it to be not more ancient than the ninth century. The *τιτλοι*, and the Ammonian sections, with references to the canons of Eusebius, are written in this manuscript *a primâ manu*. Ib. p. lxix.

PAGE 306.

262. Not in the text, but in the margin, which is a still stronger proof of the affinity of Wetstein's Codex L, to one of those collated at Alexandria in the seventh century.

263. This explanation is attended with various difficulties. To set the matter in a clear light, we must compare the two accounts of Josephus and St. Luke. The former in his *Antiquit.* xvii. 11. 4. relates, that immediately after the death of Herod the Great, his kingdom was divided into three parts, which were allotted to Archelaus, Philip, and Antipas: to Archelaus, Judæa and Samaria; to Philip, Batanæa, Trachonitis, Auranitis, with a part of what is there called *οικος Ζηνοδωρος*; to Antipas, the country beyond Jordan and Galilee. The account given by St. Luke refers to a period thirty years later, at which time he describes Pontius Pilate as governor of Judæa, Herod as tetrarch of Galilee, Philip as tetrarch of Iturea and Trachonitis, and Lyfaniaſ as tetrarch of Abilene. Since therefore these two accounts relate not only to a different period, but to a different division of the country, it is evident that the one cannot be applied in explanation of the other. That a part of the *οικος Ζηνοδωρος* was allotted to Philip in the first division, is no argument that a person of the name of Lyfaniaſ was not tetrarch of Abilene when John the Baptist began to preach; and our author's other assertion, that Lyfaniaſ was at that time certainly dead, it would be difficult to prove, since Josephus, the only writer from whom we could derive information, is totally silent in regard to a person of this name. See Lardner's Works, Vol. I. p. 21. ed. 1788. But even were these historical premises founded on fact, yet the critical conjecture, to which our author has recourse, would be still unwarranted; for if St.

Luke had intended to express 'while Philip was tetrarch of the Abilene of Lysanias,' he would have written not *Φιλίππῃ τετραρχήντος Λυσανίᾳ τῆς Ἀβιλήνης*, but *Φιλίππῃ τετραρχήντος τῆς Ἀβιλήνης τῷ Λυσανίᾳ*. To render therefore the alteration consistent with supposed historical fact, it would be necessary not only to omit the last *τετραρχήντος*, but to invert the order of the preceding words; an alteration which is too extensive to be admitted on mere conjecture.

264. This is unnoticed by Wettstein, but Griesbach has noted it in his various readings in the *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. 105.

265. Only one manuscript, beside that in question, namely the *Cod. Reuchlini*: I mean of those quoted by Wettstein. It must be particularly observed that the present inquiry relates to the *Codex Regius 2861*. noted at present 62. and marked L by Wettstein, who collated it in 1715. Whether it applies at the same time to the *Codex Stephani* η , is a matter only of opinion. This at least is certain, as I have found on examination, that of the nine readings which our author has selected in this paragraph, from different parts of the four Gospels, as some of the most remarkable among Wettstein's quotations from his *Codex L*, not one is quoted by Stephens from his *Codex* η . This may appear to weaken the generally received opinion, that they are one and the same manuscript; but Stephens might overlook the most remarkable readings: and I have collated the six first chapters of St. John's Gospel, and found that Stephens's extracts from the *Codex* η do not differ in a single instance from the extracts quoted by Griesbach from the *Codex Regius 2861*. Likewise where the *Codex 2861*. has chasms, no readings are found in Stephens's margin from the *Codex* η .

266. Here again Wettstein's *Codex L* and the *Codex Reuchlini* agree in this omission, to which in this example the *Cod. Vaticanus* alone accedes. But the coincidence of these three is great authority. Dr. Semler, in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, Vol. III. p. 163. observes,

erves, that Wetstein's Codex L agrees frequently not only with the Reuchlin, but also with the Colb. 2844.

267. Namely, in the Codex Veronensis, which has *tamen quæ sunt*, but the Vercellenfis has the reading of the Vulgate. See Blanchini *Evangeliarium quadruplex*, P. II. p. 153. The Syriac version has ܐܠܗ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ quod est; but being rendered in the Latin translation, *quod suppetit*, this reading has been overlooked, except by our author.

268. It is also in the margin of the Philoxenian version.

PAGE 307.

269. Also of the Ethiopic.

PAGE 308.

270. The Codex Regius 2865. is described by Griesbach in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. cxlii. Of the manuscript mentioned by our author in the preceding number, viz. the Codex Regius 2862. a description is given in Montfaucon's *Palæographia Græca*, p. 305—307. and p. 308. is a fac simile of its characters, from which we may judge of the Greek letters used in the twelfth century, as we know that the manuscript was written in the year 1168.

271. The date 1439. our author has copied from the *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. cxliii. but in the Paris Catalogue, Vol. II. p. 17. it is 1438.

PAGE 309.

272. In Le Long *Bibliotheca sacra*, Tom. I. p. 178. ed. Paris. the two Codices Regii 2865. are quoted in the manner mentioned by our author. But Griesbach, in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. cxli. and in his *Greek Testament*, Vol. I. p. xxvii. quotes them 2865^a. 2865^b.

PAGE 310.

274. In Griesbach's catalogue 72 is a typographical error, as that learned writer has himself informed me. Le Long, in his letter to Martin, printed in the *Journal des*

des Sçavans, Juin 1720, Vol. LXVII. p. 650. describes the Codex Stephani ε as containing the four Gospels ; but, though he represents it in the body of the letter, as one of the eight, which he had discovered in the royal library, he has neglected to mention the number at that time affixed to it, or even that it was in the library at all. This omission however, with a similar one in respect to the Codex ιε, he has supplied in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 208. ed. 1723.

275. If Wetstein's Codex 12. in the second part, 10. and 2. in the third and fourth, be the same as that which at present is noted 237. in the royal library, it is a manuscript containing scholia on the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation, accompanied with the text ; but Wetstein is silent in respect to the Scholia. Vid. *Catalogum MStorum Bibl. Regiæ*, Tom. II. p. 42. There is a circumstance relative to this manuscript, which is worthy of notice. Wetstein, Griesbach, Michaelis, with other eminent critics, are of opinion, that it is the very manuscript which Stephens quoted by the title Codex ιε. Now if this be true, it necessarily follows that Stephens had, not seven only, as is generally, and with reason supposed, but eight manuscripts of the catholic epistles: for he quotes seven manuscripts, 1 John v. 7. where ιε is not of the number. But ιε must have contained the catholic epistles, if it was the same as that which is now marked 237. because in the enumeration of the contents of this manuscript in the Paris Catalogue, the catholic epistles are particularly specified, and Wetstein has even quoted it in them. No inference however can be drawn from the silence of Stephens, in regard to the Codex ιε, to the existence of 1 John v. 7. in that manuscript ; for that the manuscript actually had the catholic epistles, depends on the hypothesis, that it is the same as that, which is now marked 237. But this manuscript (which is Wetstein's Codex 10. in the catholic epistles) certainly omits the verse, and it is quoted for that purpose both by Wetstein and Griesbach. But there is a circumstance which weakens the opinion of these eminent critics, namely, that

that Stephens has not quoted his Codex ϵ in one single instance in the catholic epistles, which he would hardly have neglected to do, (especially at the celebrated passage 1 John v. 7.) had the Codex ϵ contained them. The description which Le Long gives of the Codex ϵ , in the *Journal des Sçavans*, Vol. LXVII. p. 651. is certainly false, for he describes it as containing only ‘Sept Epistres de St. Paul, qui commencent par la premiere aux Corinthiens :’ whereas the Codex ϵ is quoted in almost every page of the book of Revelation. In describing the same manuscript in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 208. he adds to the preceding description the book of Revelation; and says (what he had omitted in the *Journal des Sçavans*) that it was then marked 2869. Now the account which Wetstein gives of the Codex Regius 2869. is very different from that which Le Long gives : but Wetstein’s account is probably the true one, as it enumerates the same books as the Paris Catalogue.

276. The Revelation of St. John is followed by a treatise of Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, on the twelve Apostles, and seventy disciples.

PAGE 311.

277. Nor are any described in the Paris Catalogue.

278. In this manuscript the parts of the N. T. are arranged in the following order: 1. The Acts. 2. The Catholic Epistles. 3. The Epistles of St. Paul. 4. The Gospels. Vid. Catal. MStorum Bibl. Reg. Tom. II. p. 18, 19. It is there referred to the twelfth century.

279. The same is asserted by Le Long, who in his *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 182. describes the Codex Regius 2872. in the following manner: Acta, et Epistolæ Apostolorum Græce, cum scholiis marginalibus. Also in the Paris Catalogue. Vol. II. p. 18. Wetstein therefore has incompletely described his Codex 11. in the third part of his N. T.

280. This last conjecture is the most probable, for Wetstein describes his Codex 11. in the first part as consisting of two volumes which contain the four Gospels,
and

and as having been brought from the Bibliotheca Telleriana. Now the MSS. noted at present 121. 122. contain together the four Gospels, were both brought from the Bibliotheca Telleriana, and as appears from the description, p. 20. of the above-quoted catalogue, are only two parts of the same manuscript. But the Codex 119. though likewise brought from the Bibliotheca Telleriana, consists only of one volume.

281. Both this manuscript and the preceding are quoted by Küster, as noted formerly in the royal library 3424. in which he is followed by Wettstein and other editors. But Le Long, in his *Bib. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 178. distinguishes them by the addition of the figures 2, 3; namely 3424², 3424³, which corresponds with the general account given by Fleischer. Montfaucon, in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 280. has very minutely described the Codex Regius 3424. He refers it to the tenth century, and has given a fac simile of its characters, p. 282. In his *Bibl. biblioth.* Tom. II. p. 742. he says it was written A. C. 942.

CODICES T. ROE.

PAGE 313.

282. Also with the Ethiopic, and the Arabic of Erpenius.

CODEx RUTGERSII.

PAGE 314.

283. The best edition of this work was printed at Cambridge 1640, in 4to. Where the MS. itself is at present is unknown.

CODEx SANGERMANENSIS.

284. This MS. takes its name from the Benedictine monastery of St. Germain des Prez in Paris, in the library of which it is preserved. The manuscripts of this
library

library are described in Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 1041—1165. A description of this manuscript in particular is given in Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 218. and in the plate fronting this page is a fac simile of its characters, both Greek and Latin. It is written in uncial letters, and with accents and marks of aspiration, a *primâ manu*, as Montfaucon expressly declares, who supposes it however to be as ancient as the seventh century. See also Le Long *Bibl. sacra*, Tom. I. p. 175. 184. There is another more ancient *Codex Sangermanensis* of St. Paul's Epistles, which has never been collated. It is properly only a fragment, as it contains no more than thirteen leaves; but it is supposed by Montfaucon to be as ancient as the fifth century. See his *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. II. p. 1041:

285. Dr. Semler, in the 4th volume of his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, published several years before the letter to which our author alludes, has called in question the generally received opinion that the *Sangermanensis* is a mere copy of the *Claromontanus*. He produces, p. 63—65. many examples, from which it appears that if the copyist, who wrote the former, had actually the latter before his eyes, he must at least have selected various readings from other manuscripts. It seems then the *Sangermanensis* is a kind of *Codex eclecticus*, in the writing of which the *Claromontanus* was principally, but not at all times consulted. The assertion therefore of our author, that these manuscripts are not to be considered as separate evidence, must be admitted with certain restrictions.

C O D E X S C A L I G E R I.

286. This manuscript is marked 243. among Scaliger's Oriental manuscripts, preserved in the University Library of Leyden, and is described p. 410. of the *Catalogus Librorum bibliothecæ Lugduno-Batavæ*, 1716, folio.

CODICES SELDENI.

PAGE 315.

287. These manuscripts are described in the Catalog. MStorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ, Tom. I. p. 157—167. Our author enumerates only those five, which were collated by Mill: But Griesbach has not only re-collated two of these five, but has likewise examined two other Codices Seldeni, containing lessons from the four Gospels. In his catalogue of Evangelistaria they are numbered 26, and 27.

CODICES STEPHANICI.

PAGE 317.

288. Our author has expressed himself in this last paragraph in such general terms, that most readers would suppose, Le Long had actually discovered in the royal library in Paris all the seven manuscripts which Robert Stephens quotes, 1 John v. 7. but Le Long did not even attempt to discover more than four of the seven, (though he discovered four other manuscripts not included in that number) because four only of *those* seven had been borrowed by Stephens from the royal library. These were the Codices δ, ε, ζ, ι, which Le Long found to correspond to the MSS. marked in his time in the King's Library 2871, 3425, 2242, 2870. See Bib. sacra, Tom. I. p. 208. Of the other three, which Stephens quotes, 1 John v. 7. viz. those marked θ, ια, ιγ, Wettstein supposes that the Codex θ is the same as the Coislinianus 200. which is preserved in the library of St. Germain des Prez; of the ια no traces have hitherto been discovered; but the Codex ιγ is the same as that which is now preserved in the University Library of Cambridge, and marked Kk 6. 4. of which I shall take notice, Note 291, in the table of Stephens's manuscripts.

289. Our author is here inaccurate in saying, 'eight of which were discovered to be the Codices Stephani, as the characteristic readings above-mentioned were discovered in them, and in no other manuscript *in the whole library.*' For Le Long himself asserts that he examined
only

only *eleven*, which our author likewise repeats in the next sentence, where he says, “ This was an easy and sure method, as it was necessary to examine only eleven manuscripts; but if we had to search among all the known manuscripts, it would be difficult to ascertain them, even if the data amounted to an hundred *lectiones singulares*.’

With respect to the method adopted by Le Long, in order to discover the eight manuscripts, which Stephens had borrowed from the royal library, it would be perfectly satisfactory, if he had proved *a priori*, that they were necessarily contained among the eleven, which he selected for examination. But if we fail in the proof of these premises, all conclusions deduced from the inquiry must be vague and indecisive. Le Long contends that the eight MSS. borrowed from the royal library by Stephens, must be in the number of these eleven, 1st. because R. Stephens had said in his Greek Preface that eight of his manuscripts came *ἐκ τῆς τῆς βασιλικῆς βιβλιοθήκης*; and 2dly. because the eleven, which he selected, were the only manuscripts in the royal library, which had an H with a crown over it, as having formerly belonged to Henry II. Now it is true that Martin was mistaken in saying that, as Stephens collated his manuscripts in the time of Francis I., these manuscripts *must* now have an F on the cover, and not an H; for they *might* have been bound again in the time of Henry II. in which case they would be found not with an F, but with an H, agreeably to the known practice in the royal library. But on the other hand, we must not forget, that this is mere possibility, not certainty: and Martin’s adversaries may have been as much mistaken in concluding that the MSS. borrowed by Stephens in the time of Francis I. were re-bound in the time of Henry II. as Martin himself was in supposing that they had continued ever since in the same binding. For admitting, by way of argument, that all the manuscripts which were in the royal library in the time of Francis I. have been since re-bound, is it a necessary consequence that they were re-bound precisely in the time of Henry II? Is it not

not possible that some of them were re-bound in the time of Charles IX? Is it not possible that some of them continued in the same binding till 1610? Is it not possible also that MSS. bound in the time of Henry II. might have been bound again between the years 1610 and 1720, when Le Long published his letter to Martin? But all manuscripts in the royal library bound since 1610 have neither an F nor an H, but an L on them, because every king of France since 1610 has been called Louis. It is therefore by no means certain a priori that the eleven, with an H on their covers, which Le Long selected for examination, necessarily included the eight which had been borrowed by Stephens in the time of Francis I. In fact, Le Long was led into error by the word 'Henricus' in Stephens's preface; it never occurred to him, that the manuscripts borrowed by Stephens in the time of Francis I. were re-bound in the time of Henry II. which is a mere hypothesis, adopted afterwards by Martin's adversaries in order to confute his objections to Le Long; and if Stephens had written his preface to the ed. of 1550, in the same reign, in which the manuscripts were collated, and had used therefore the word Franciscus, instead of Henricus, it is probable that Le Long would have searched only for MSS. with an F on them, of which some remain to this very day, as appears from the account given by Mr. Fleischer in the page, which follows that, to which this note refers. It appears therefore from the preceding statement, that the eight manuscripts borrowed by Robert Stephens are not necessarily included among those which are marked with an H; and according to the testimony of Mr. Fleischer the manuscript, which is supposed to be the same as the Codex Stephani γ, is still marked with an F. If Le Long had examined every manuscript of the Greek Testament which had been preserved in the royal library, ever since the time of Henry II. the eight which had been borrowed by Stephens, would certainly have been included in the number. It was Le Long's intention to do so, as appears from his letter to Martin; but the criterion which he adopted for the
the

the discovery of those manuscripts, which had been there ever since the time of Henry II. namely, that they were marked on the cover with an H, is wholly devoid of certainty, since the manuscripts, which he sought might have been marked either with an F or with an L, as easily as with an H. Wetstein indeed affirms, Vol. II. p. 12. of the Codex Stephani is in particular, though of no other of Stephens's manuscripts, that it was new bound in the time of Henry II. 'Codex Stephani is iterum compactus est, Henrico II. Galliarum rege.' But to what does this testimony amount? Shall we conclude that the manuscript had been in the royal library in the time of Francis I. because a new cover was given it in the time of Henry II.? By no means. The fact is simply this. Wetstein observes that the Codex Regius 2869. (which is his Codex 12. in the second part of his N. T. (has the insignia of Henry II. on the cover: this MS. he believes, and probably with some reason, to be the same, as that which Stephens formerly used and quoted by the title is: but as none of the manuscripts when used by Stephens could have had the insignia of Henry II. he concludes that the Codex is had belonged to Francis I. and was new bound in the time of Henry II. Now admitting this conclusion to be just, and sufficiently warranted by the coincidence which Wetstein observed between the extracts from the two manuscripts, it is still only an argumentum a posteriori, and proves the fact of only one manuscript. But if we quote Wetstein's authority in favour of the opinion, that the MSS. in question were new bound in the time of Henry II. in order to justify Le Long's procedure, we shall almost argue in a circle, since in order to justify his procedure it is necessary to shew *a priori* that the eleven manuscripts selected by Le Long, were new bound in the time of Henry II. and that they necessarily included the eight, which he sought, because otherwise a coincidence in only four lectiones singulares would be no criterion at all. If a complete collation had ever been made of *all* the eight manuscripts, produced by Le Long,

with all the readings quoted by Stephens from the eight, which are supposed to correspond to them, and these extracts in general coincided, we might safely pronounce that all the eight were discovered. But this would be an argument of a very different kind, and in this case it would be wholly unnecessary to inquire, whether the MSS. had an F, an H, or an L, on their covers. But only two of these eight, viz. the Cod. η and ϵ have been completely re-collated; and for the other six, we depend on the coincidence of four or five readings, which is very insufficient till certain premises are established, which never have been proved. The manuscripts now preserved in the royal library in Paris, which contain either the whole or parts of the Greek Testament, amount to not less than an hundred and ninety-five, and though at least three-fourths of them have been deposited there *since* the commencement of the reign of Henry II. yet the remainder, which were in the royal library before that period, amounts probably to many more than eleven. The contrary at least has never been shewn, and this alone is sufficient to render Le Long's premises uncertain. Our author himself acknowledges that the truth of Le Long's conclusion depends on the position, that the eleven manuscripts, which he selected for examination, necessarily included the eight, which he sought; since a coincidence in four or five *lectiones singulares*, from which Le Long argued, would otherwise be very insufficient to establish the identity of the manuscripts. But as the position above-mentioned is by no means clear, Le Long's discovery though it *may* be true, is yet not attended with that certainty, with which it is generally believed to be. Critics are often too hasty in arguing to the identity of a manuscript from the coincidence of a few readings: and many supposed discoveries of this kind, after having been so warmly defended, that those who have ventured to doubt, have been treated with contempt and ridicule, will be proved perhaps by subsequent critics to be totally false. Wetstein was thoroughly persuaded that, in addition to the eight Codices Stephani,

phani, which are the subject of our present inquiry, he had discovered the Codex δ , and very confidently relates in his Prolegomena, p. 46. that this manuscript, after having been preserved in the library of St. Victor, and then in the library of Tellier, was at last deposited in the royal library, and there marked 2865. Now if this position had remained unexamined, it would have been as confidently repeated, as it was confidently asserted. But Griesbach, on inquiring into the truth of this happy discovery, found that the extracts quoted by Stephens from the Codex δ , differed in such a manner from the readings of the Codex Regius 2865. as to make it impossible for them to be one and the same manuscript. He says therefore in his Symbolæ, p. cxliv. *Falsissima sunt, quæ de Stephani codice δ in prolegomenis tradit Wetstenius.*

Before I conclude this subject, it is necessary to observe that the object of the preceding remarks is not to shew that the eight manuscripts discovered by Le Long were not the MSS. used by R. Stephens, since the thing itself is by no means impossible. Two of them, namely the Codices Regii 2861. and 2869. which Le Long supposes to be the same as the Codices Stephani η , and ϵ , have been completely collated by Wetstein, whose collation strengthens the opinion of Le Long. As far as concerns therefore the Codex η , and the Codex ϵ , we have additional evidence in favour of the opinion that they are the same, as the Codices Regii 2861. and 2869. because Wetstein has found that, not four only, but that the readings quoted in general in Stephens's margin from the Codices η , and ϵ , are found in the Cod. Regii 2861. and 2869. But for the opinion that the six remaining manuscripts, namely, the Codices Stephani γ , δ , ϵ , ζ , ι , are the same as the Codices Regii 2867, 2871, 3425, 2866, 2242, 2870, (the numbers assigned to them in Le Long's Bib. sacra, Tom. I. p. 208.) we rely on the propriety of the process adopted by Le Long, and which has been the subject of inquiry in this note. For though Wetstein speaks of these six Codices Regii, as manuscripts

which he had seen, and describes them as the same with the above-mentioned six Codices Stephani; yet, as he nowhere says that he collated, or even examined their readings, as he had done of the other two, it is reasonable to suppose that he grounded his opinion of the identity of these MSS. merely on the authority of Le Long. See the account which Wetstein has given in his *Prolegomena* of the manuscripts which he has noted L, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, in the first part of his N. T. and 9, 12, in the second.

But whatever be the uncertainty, with which Le Long's discovery is attended, no inference can be drawn from it in favour of Martin's opinion with respect to the authenticity of the celebrated passage in the first epistle of St. John. For whether the eight manuscripts, which Stephens borrowed, are in the number of the eleven selected by Le Long, or not, they certainly are *somewhere* in the royal library. The notion that Stephens never returned them, but that he took them with him to Switzerland, when he left Paris, is highly absurd. In his *Answer to the Paris Divines*, p. 37. (Wetstenii N. T. Vol. II. p. 724.) he declares that he had returned all his manuscripts; and as these very manuscripts were at that time a subject of public controversy, it is wholly incredible, if he had asserted a falsehood, that it should have remained undetected. It was certainly known in the royal library, whether he had returned them or not, and as R. Stephens was narrowly watched and persecuted by the Paris Divines, they neither would nor could have failed to detect the falsehood, if the manuscripts had not been returned. Now there is not a single MS. of the catholic epistles, in the royal library in Paris, which has not been searched, for evidence either in favour of, or against 1 John v. 7; but in not a single manuscript in the whole library has this verse been discovered: I mean in the text, for some of them have glosses in the margin, which are similar to, though not the same as the common text, 1 John v. 7. Of the eight MSS. which Stephens borrowed from the royal library, four, namely δ, ε, ζ, ι, contained

tained the catholic epistles : these four he quotes 1 John v. 7. in conjunction with three other manuscripts, which he had borrowed elsewhere. Now as he quotes all seven as agreeing in the same omission, whatever was wanting in four of them, must have been wanting likewise in the other three. But in the four, which are in the royal library, the whole of 1 John v. 7. is wanting, (not merely the words *εν τω ποσειδι*, as many have supposed from the position of Stephens's semicircle), for there is *not one in the whole library* which has the verse. It is certain therefore that the verse was omitted in all seven, and that Stephens's semicircle is misplaced. See Simon Dissertation critique sur les manuscrits du Nouveau Testament, p. 14. See also the Table of Stephens's MSS. in the following Note 291. with the remark on the Codex 17.

PAGE 321.

290. This assertion has never been proved : and its want of proof is the very circumstance, which renders Le Long's method of proceeding less satisfactory than it would have been, as appears from the preceding note.

PAGE 322.

291. It is true that Le Long, in his letter to Martin, asserts that he had discovered the *eight* manuscripts in question, and refers to the table at the end of the letter, p. 650. for the numbers at that time affixed to them in the royal library : but, through some extraordinary neglect, he has mentioned the numbers of only *six*, and of the two to which he has assigned no numbers, namely, the Cod. 5, and 16, he has described the latter in such a manner, as to make it doubtful whether he had even seen it. See the Journal des Sçavans, Vol. LXVII. p. 650, 651. This defect however he has in some measure supplied in the edition of his Bibliotheca sacra, which was published three years after he wrote the letter to Martin. See Tom. I. p. 208. where he mentions the numbers affixed to 5, and 16, and gives a more complete descrip-

tion of the latter, though even this is different from the description, which has since been given by Wetstein.

As the accounts, which have been given of Stephens's manuscripts, are in general attended with some difficulty, it will be useful to present the reader with a table, not only of the eight in question, but of all the sixteen, representing the libraries, where they are at present preserved, with the numbers now affixed to them, the persons by whom they were discovered, and the collations, which have been made of them since the time of Stephens. I shall make the statement according to the opinion at present commonly received, without entering into any controversy with respect to the propriety of that opinion. The doubts, which attend the discovery and identity, of some of these manuscripts, I have stated in the preceding notes, wherever the subject has related to each of them in particular.

Table of Stephens's manuscripts.

- α. Complutensian edition.
- β. Codex Bezae, or Cantabrigiensis, re-collated by Junius, Usher, Mill, and Wetstein.
- γ. Codex Regius 2867. n. 84. discovered by Le Long, but not since collated.
- δ. Codex Regius 2871. n. 106. discovered by Le Long, but not since collated.
- ε. Codex Regius 3425. n. 112. discovered by Le Long, but not since collated.
- ς. Codex Regius 2866. n. 71. discovered by Le Long, but not since collated.
- ζ. Codex Regius 2242. n. 47. discovered by Le Long, but not since collated.
- η. Codex Regius 2861. n. 62. discovered by Le Long, and re-collated by Wetstein and Griefbach.
- θ. Codex Coislinianus 200. discovered by Wetstein, who re-collated it.
- ι. Codex Regius 2870. n. 102. discovered by Le Long, but not since collated.
- κα. Not yet discovered.

β. Codex

- β. Codex Regius 2862. n. 83. N. B. This manuscript was brought into the royal library at the end of the last century, having formerly belonged to Petrus Stella, and afterwards to Tellier. It was collated for Küster's edition of Mill's Greek Testament; and its identity with the Codex Stephani β was first observed by Wettstein.
- γ. This manuscript I have discovered in the University library of Cambridge, where it is marked Kk. 6. 4*.
- δ. Codex Victorinus 774. discovered by Griesbach, who has re-collated it.
- ε. Codex Regius 2869. n. 237. discovered by Le Long, and re-collated by Wettstein.
- ζ. Not yet discovered.

CODICES

* The MS. thus marked, as appears from the name being written in it, belonged formerly to Vatablus, who was Hebrew Professor at Paris in the time of R. Stephens, and one of his most intimate friends. Now as Stephens, beside the Codex β, and the eight, which he borrowed from the royal library, procured six others, 'quos undique corrogare licuit,' to use his own expression, it is hardly credible that he should have neglected so ancient and valuable a manuscript, as that of Vatablus certainly is, since the manuscript could not have been unknown to him. The Codex Stephani γ corresponds, as to its contents, to the Codex Vatabli, which is a manuscript of the A&Ts and all the epistles. I selected therefore from Stephens's margin *all* the readings which he has quoted from the Codex γ alone, throughout the catholic epistles; these I compared with the Codex Vatabli, and, though they amounted to twenty-five, and several of them have been discovered in no manuscript since the time of Stephens, I found them all in the Codex Vatabli, or Codex Kk. 6. 4. without any exception, and without the least variation. This extraordinary coincidence, united with the circumstance, that the MS. which I examined belonged to one of Stephens's most intimate friends, affords the strongest proof, that the Codex Stephani γ is the same as the Codex Vatabli. Now this manuscript omits the whole of 1 John v. 7. and clearly proves therefore, as the Codex γ is one of those, which are quoted at that verse, that Stephens's semicircle is misplaced.

This Note was written in the first edition: and in consequence of its having been called in question, I have instituted a very minute inquiry into the subject, which has fully established the identity of the Codex γ and the Codex Vatabli. See my Letters to Archdeacon Travis. On the Codices Regii, collated by R. Stephens, see the Appendix to those Letters.

CODICES TOMÆ HARCELENSIS.

The name of this editor of the Philoxenian version should be expressed in Latin by 'Thomas Harceleusis,' (not Heracleensis) and in English by 'Thomas of Har-kel,' (not Charkel). See Note 15. to ch. vii. sect. 11.

PAGE 329.

291. Our author should have said at the beginning of the seventh century. See the Notes 18—22. to ch. vii. sect. 11.

292. See chap. vii. sect. 11. with the notes to that section.

PAGE 330.

293. Namely, at least two manuscripts of the Gospels, one of the Acts, and two of the Epistles. See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 112, 113. and Ridley de Verf. Syr. sect. 9.

294. Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 113.

295. In the Orient. Bibl. Vol. XVI. p. 164—168. where our author reviews White's edition of the Philoxenian version, he gives examples of orthographical errors in the Greek readings in the margin of that version, as written in Ridley's manuscript: they relate chiefly to a confusion of *o* with *ω*, and *i* with *η* and *ει*, as may be seen on consulting White's edition. In the Or. Bibl. Vol. XVII. p. 126—133. he has printed a letter written by Professor Adler, from which it appears that the Greek marginal readings in the Codex Angelicus are still more inaccurately written than in Ridley's manuscript. But the MS. in which they are most correctly written, is that noted by Adler Codex Assēmanianus 2. which our author has omitted to mention, though he published in his Orient. Bibl. Vol. XVIII. p. 173. Adler's account of it. This learned writer also, in his Verf. Syr. p. 65. says of this manuscript, *Græcæ voces accuratius etiam quam in præcedenti (scil. Assēmaniano 1.) absque mendo fere exaratae sunt, sed minus nitidæ.*

296. The marginal Greek readings in the Philoxenian version are of three different kinds. 1. Such as correspond

correspond to the Syriac both in sense and in form, whether adopted in the Syriac from the Greek, or in the Greek Testament from the Syriac. Of this kind are all the examples produced by our author, except *υδραις* and *εμπορεις*. 2. Such as correspond to the Syriac in sense only: of this kind are *υδραις* and *εμπορεις*. 3. Such as differ both in form and in sense, and denote a various reading. But these last are not numerous. It may be observed of the Greek readings in general which are noted in this version, that they are of much less importance than the Syriac; they frequently betray great ignorance, and it is often difficult to comprehend for what purpose they are added. For these reasons Professor Storr, in the *Repertorium*, Vol. VII. p. 15. absolutely denies that the Greek readings proceeded from Thomas of Herculæa, or, as he ought to be called, Thomas of Harkel.

297. The Syriac marginal notes of the Philoxenian version may be divided into two principal classes. 1. Critical. 2. Explanatory. The former relate sometimes to the collated Greek manuscripts, at other times to the old Syriac version, and perhaps frequently to both. The latter are likewise of a twofold nature, referring sometimes to the Syriac translation, at other times to the Greek original.

PAGE 331.

298. As *ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲓⲛⲉⲛⲥ ⲉⲓⲟⲥ*, the marginal reading of the Philoxenian version, John i. 18. is in the old Syriac in the text itself, it is evident that reference is made to this version. But whether the editor of the Philoxenian version intended at the same time to signify that the same reading, namely *μονογενὴς θεός*, was also in his Greek manuscripts, is at present difficult to determine: it is however highly probable, since *μονογενὴς θεός* is the reading of the Alexandrine edition, as appears from the quotations of Clement, Origen, Cyril, and Athanasius, and from the Coptic and Ethiopic versions. But of the manuscripts which have been collated in modern times, the Codex Stephani n, and Colbertinus 2844. alone have this reading.

299. This

299. This addition might likewise have been found in the Alexandrine manuscripts, collated by Thomas, as well as in the old Syriac, for it is both in the Coptic and Ethiopic. The only manuscripts, in which modern critics have discovered it, are the Cyprius, Colb. 6043. Medicæus, and the Codices Regii 50. and 64. as marked at present.

300. This is a mistake, for Thomas, the editor of the Philoxenian version, lived in the seventh century, as appears from the Notes 18—22. to chap. vii. sect. 11.

PAGE 332.

301. The charge, though not probable, is not wholly incredible, as appears from Note 27. to this section. Nor was the influence of the church of Rome inconsiderable even in Alexandria, especially in the fourth and fifth centuries, in which period the MSS. collated by Thomas were probably written. Vid. Semleri *Commentarii historici de antiquo Christianorum statu*, Tom. I. § 82.

302: Read seventh century.

303. On this subject the learned and sagacious Wetstein has been very unjustly exposed to ridicule, to which Dr. Ridley's eloquence, in the fifteenth section of his *Dissertation de versionibus Syriacis*, has not a little contributed. It has been asserted, that Wetstein's conjecture, that these four manuscripts were used by Thomas, must be without foundation, because it appears from the subscription to the Philoxenian version, that three at the utmost were collated for the Gospels. But it has been totally forgotten, that Thomas collated also one manuscript for the Acts of the Apostles, a book which is not contained in the Codex Stephani, and at least two for the epistles, which are neither in the Cod. Stephani, nor in the Cantabrigiensis. This circumstance alone therefore decides nothing, since of these four manuscripts he might have used three for the Gospels, one for the Acts, and two for the Epistles, viz. the Alexandrinus and Ephrem, in which alone, of these four, the epistles are contained. This remark is made, not with a view of defending the opinion of Wetstein, which may
be

be confuted on other grounds, as appears from the Notes to these four manuscripts, but merely to rescue a character, to which sacred criticism is under the highest obligations, from the charge of an absurdity.

304. To each of the following Syriac quotations our author has subjoined a German translation, for which, instead of translating it into English, I have substituted White's Latin translation, which corresponds to the Syriac as accurately as possible. I have likewise corrected from White's text some inaccuracies in our author, and have made some trifling alterations in the statement of those examples, which in the original seemed obscure.

PAGE 353.

305. If I understand our author rightly, he means that ܐܕܝܢ should be written ܐܕܝܢ, and ܐܕܝܢ written ܐܕܝܢ. With respect to the latter, the very same orthography which is found in Ridley's MS. or in the Oxford edition, is observed likewise in the Cod. Aſſemanianus 2. the most correct manuscript of the Philoxenian version hitherto discovered. See Adler's *Verf. Syr.* p. 123. In regard to the former, it is more probable that Thomas actually wrote ܐܕܝܢ, as found in Ridley's MS., than ܐܕܝܢ, as our author conjectures, because there is added in Greek, Βησαρεα (Βησαρεα), which corresponds to the Syriac as written in the manuscript, but not to our author's alteration: and it necessarily follows, that if Thomas wrote in Syriac ܐܕܝܢ, he wrote in Greek Βησαρεα, but the Greek is not written in this manner in the Philoxenian version. The following is perhaps the true statement of this example. In the text of the Philoxenian, as well as the old Syriac version, John i. 28. we find ܐܕܝܢ, which corresponds to Βησαρια: but Thomas, on collating his Alexandrine MSS. found here a different reading, which is usually written Βησαρεα, but was either written Βησαρεα, in the manuscript used by Thomas, or he took it for such: he wrote therefore in the margin of his new edition Βησαρεα, (for the omission of ܐ is the erratum of a copyist, as will appear from the

the following note) and expressed this reading in Syriac by a twofold orthography, ܐܪܥܐ and ܐܪܥܐ, both of which denote *αραεα*, thereby intending to signify, that as *Βηθανια* in the Greek had a various reading *Βηθαραεα*, so the Syriac ܐܪܥܐ ܐܪܥܐ should have likewise a various reading, which might be expressed either ܐܪܥܐ ܐܪܥܐ or ܐܪܥܐ ܐܪܥܐ. The coincidence of the Greek reading, as written in the margin of the Philoxenian version, with the two modes of expressing the same in Syriac, clearly shew that no inversion has taken place in the Syriac through the negligence of a copyist, unless we suppose that mere accident has produced the same inversion in all three words, which is wholly incredible.

306. Admitting that the ancient Syrians pronounced ܐܪܥܐ as if it were written ܐܪܥܐ, which no one however can positively affirm, it is no necessary consequence that, because they dropped the Tau in speaking Syriac, they therefore left out Theta in writing Greek, especially as ܐܪܥܐ itself, even if pronounced in that manner, was not written without the Tau. In fact *Βηθαραεα*, in Ridley's copy, is a mere erratum for *Βηθαραεα*, as appears from the more correct manuscript the Codex Aſſemianus 2. in which Theta is very distinctly expressed. See Adler's *Verf. Syr.* p. 123.

307. This note therefore proceeded not from Thomas, the editor of the Philoxenian version, but from a former Syrian proprietor of Ridley's manuscript, who had examined different copies of it. White also expressly relates, that it was written a recentiori manu. See his note to this passage, p. 623.

308. In the Vercellensis, Veronensis, and Corbeiensis, but in a different position. See Blanchini *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, P. I. p. 276, 277.

309. The Ethiopic version expresses 'vinum non habebant, quia defecit vinum eorum:' but this clause is found, not in the first verse, to which the marginal reading of the Philoxenian version refers, but in the third verse, where *υπερησαντος οινου* is used in the Greek. From this,

this, and the preceding note, it is reasonable to suppose that the reference of the Philoxenian version is originally a mistake, and that it properly belongs to the third verse, where it is possible that Thomas found in Greek MSS. the reading in question, but certainly not in the first.

PAGE 334.

310. Also in the Ethiopic, and Armenian, and in one instance in Origen. See Griesbach in loco.

311. Rather καὶ ἀπηλθεν.

PAGE 335.

312. In the Coptic this reading is wholly omitted. See Wettstein and Griesbach in loco.

313. That no single manuscript, among the four which Wettstein believed to have been collated at Alexandria, has all the variations which are noted in the four first chapters of St. John, in the margin of the Philoxenian version, is no argument against Wettstein's opinion; for, as Thomas selected readings from more than one MS. we cannot expect to find them all in one alone. Wettstein's adversaries therefore have no reason to triumph, since this argument, by which they endeavour to confute his opinion, is not more solid than those, by which he endeavoured to establish it. Professor Adler, in his *Verf. Syr.* p. 132. makes the following very just observation, particularly in reference to the *Codex Cantabrigiensis*, *Quæ quidem sententia, me iudice, eo probari non potest, quod lectiones hujus codicis singulares in suis quoque exemplis invenerit, neque eo refelli, quod vel alias varietates observaverit criticus, quæ in Cantabrigiensi desint, plures enim codices eum consuluisse scimus, vel multas omiserit quæ in Cantabrigiensi servantur, non enim omnes codicum suorum lectiones, sed eas tantum attulisse videtur, quæ ipsi probabiliores haberentur.*

This learned writer has, in the above-mentioned work, p. 79—132. given a very complete and accurate collation of the marginal readings of the Philoxenian version of

of the four Gospels, with some of the best Greek MSS. now extant, of which collation the following is the result. Itaque inter CLXXX circiter varietates centies tricies fere consentiunt codices Vaticanus, Ephrem, Cantabrigiensis, Stephani 7, Reuchlini, Colb. 2844. Leicestrensis, Urb. 2. Vindob. 31. et undevigesies solus Cantabrigiensis. E quo manifeste patet codices Thomæ e recensione Constantinopolitana, quam exhibent plurimi codices Mosquenses, longissime abesse, et vel mixtum ex Alexandria et Occidentali contextum exhibuisse, vel alios ad illam, alios ad hanc recensioem pertinuisse. P. 133. after having examined the question, whether the Cod. Cant. was in the number of the manuscripts collated by Thomas, and answered it in the negative, he adds, Quicquid sit, illud tamen extra omnem dubitationem ponitur codices Thomæ simillimos fuisse Cantabrigiensis, e quo non tantum huic codici, sed etiam recensioi novum pretium accedit. Imo codices Thomæ meliores, me iudice, habendæ sunt, illis quibus in edenda versione usus fuerat Philoxenus vel Polycarpus, quæ licet vulgo eandem recensioem sequatur, multas recepit lectiones, quæ in probatis exemplis vix reperiuntur.

PAGE 336.

314. In no critical edition of the Greek Testament, because Griesbach's, which is the last that contains extracts from all the known manuscripts and versions, was published before White's edition. The learned editor therefore could draw from no other source, than the extracts of Wettstein. But a very complete collation of the text of the Philoxenian version is given by Storr, in the seventh volume of the Repertorium; and of the marginal readings, to which the present inquiry is properly confined, in the above-quoted work of Professor Adler.

315. Namely in the Codex Affermanianus I. See Adler's *Verf. Syr.* p. 90, 91. N. B. It must not be supposed that the expression 'fifty-third chapter of St. Luke,' in the sentence following that to which this note refers,

is

is an erratum; for the ancient κεφαλαία were more numerous, than our modern chapters.

316. Our author has here printed a letter from Adler, relative to the Philoxenian version, but an extract is here unnecessary, because at present the most complete information may be had in Adler's own publication, *Verf. Syr.* p. 79—132. where those marginal readings, which are not found in Ridley's manuscript, are carefully distinguished from those, which it has either in common with other manuscripts of this version, or peculiar to itself.

317. Storr and Adler have brought us at least to an intermediate state, between infancy and manhood.

C O D E X T I G U R I N U S.

318. Wettstein says, *Deprehendi autem certis indiciis hunc codicem esse απογραφου editionis Erasmi primæ.* This manuscript is preserved in the library belonging to the town of Zürich in Switzerland. See Wettstein, *Vol. II.* p. 15.

C O D E X A U L Æ T R I N I T A T I S.

319. This manuscript is at present not to be found in the library of Trinity Hall: nor does James mention it in his Catalogue, published in 1600. Mill himself does not say that he ever saw it there, but relates only (*Prol.* 1470.) that he had received some extracts of the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first of St. John, from Dr. Batteley, who told him they were taken some years before from an ancient *Lectionarium* belonging to Trinity Hall.

C O D E X T R I T H E M I I.

PAGE 337.

320. Trithemius, or according to his German name, Tritenheim, was a Benedictine Abbot, first in the monastery of Spanheim in the Electorate of Mayntz, and afterwards

afterwards in that of St. James in Würzburg. He died in 1516.

321. The German title is, *Reuß Beschreibung einiger Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Tübingen.*

CODICES UFFENBACHIANI.

322. The Codices Uffenbachiani are described in the *Bibliotheca Uffenbachiana MSta*, seu *Catalogus et recensio MStorum codicum qui in bibliotheca Zach. Conr. ab Uffenbach Trajecti ad Mœnum adservantur, et in varias classes distinguuntur, quorum priores J. H. Maius Prof. Ord. Gießenfis recensuit, reliquas possessor ipse digessit.* Halæ Herm. 1720, fol.

PAGE 338.

323. The common reading Ephes. vi. 22. is *να γνωτε τα περι ημων*, which gives a perfectly good sense, and is well adapted to the context. The manuscript in question has here *να γνωτε τα περι υμων*, which is not good sense, and *υμων* is evidently an erratum of a copyist for *ημων*, for which reason Griesbach has not noted it. But our author, in order to procure it a sense, divides *γνωτε* into two words, and omits the *τα*, whether by accident or design I know not. But it is probable that here is a typographical error, and that he meant *να γνωτε τα περι υμων*.

324. Our author considers therefore the Codex Uffenbachianus 3. of which Bengel has given a few extracts, as the same with that which Professor Schulz discovered in the University Library of Gießen: Griesbach on the contrary considers them as two distinct manuscripts, denoting the one Codex 101. or Uffenbachianus 3. the other Codex 122. or Codex Gießenfis. It is necessary therefore to examine which of these two eminent critics is mistaken. Now there is a passage in Bengel's *Introductio in Crisin Nov. Test.* § 7. which seems to put the matter out of doubt. *Addi poterat Uff. 3. qui habet Ev. Johannis, et συζητης quidem est, sed plane recens,*

cens, et cum edd. priscis Basileensibus ita congruit, ut ex earum aliqua descriptus existimari debeat. Tres hosce, et Hirsaugiensem illum, et alia complura, impertiit nobis Z. C. ab Uffenbach. Here the Codex Hirsaugienfis is manifestly distinguished from the three Codices Uffenbachiani denoted 1, 2, 3. and this very Codex Hirsaugienfis is that which is now at Gießen, being written by Nicolaus monachus Hirsaugienfis, as appears from the subscription. Besides, the Uffenbachianus 3. is, according to Bengel, a copy of the Basél edition; the Cod. Hirsaugienfis, preserved at Gießen, according to Maius, who collated it, and whose extracts Schulz communicated to our author, is a copy of the Codex Trithemii, preserved in the Bodleian. Griesbach therefore has very properly distinguished them. But whether this eminent critic has not made another mistake, in reckoning as two different manuscripts his Codex 97. and Codex 122. the former of which he terms Hirsaugienfis, the latter Giefsensis, which appear to be one and the same manuscript, I leave to his own decision. See Note 195.

CODEx BIB. S. VICTORIS.

325. Our author therefore has counted the same manuscript twice.

CODEx UPSALENSIS.

A manuscript of the Acts, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the catholic epistles, has been collated, and described by Professor Aurivillius, in the following work, Codex manuscriptus Græcus Novi Fœderis, e bibliotheca Academica Upsalienfi descriptus, et collatus a P. F. Aurivillio, Upsaliæ 1786, 4to.

CODICES USSERII.

PAGE 339.

326. These two manuscripts of Usher have been the subject of many conjectures, among the critics of the New Testament. Where Usher procured them is un-

VOL. II.

E e e

known,

known, but it is certain, that after his death, which happened March 20th, 1656, they were purchased, with his other manuscripts and printed books, which amounted together to ten thousand, by the officers and soldiers of Cromwell's army, who sent them over to Ireland, where they were deposited in Dublin Castle. There they remained till the Restoration, when they were transferred to the library of Trinity College in Dublin, where the two manuscripts in question, the Codex Usser. 1. et 2. were collated by Dodwell for Fell's edition, and by Bulkeley for that of Mill. See Parr's Life of Ussher, p. 80—102. Fell's preface to his edition of the Greek Testament, and Mill's Prol. § 1459. Wetstein's conjecture therefore, (Prol. p. 52.) that the Cod. Usser. 1. (now marked D. 20. in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, see the Cat. MSS. Angl. et Hib. T. II. P. II. p. 28. N°. 414.) is the same as the Cod. Henrici Googe, seems improbable, because Walton, in the Catalogue of MSS. prefixed to the Variantes Lectiones Novi Testamenti in the last volume of the London Polyglot, which was published in 1657, a year after Ussher's death, describes the Codex Henrici Googe, as being at that time the property of Dr. Henry Googe, who had lately been Fellow of Trinity College in Cambridge. It is however possible, that the collation of the Codex Googii had been made many years before the publication of the Polyglot, that Ussher bought the manuscript shortly before his death, and that Walton, ignorant of this circumstance, described it as being the property of the same person, as it was, when the collation was made.

The Codex Usserii 2. is noted F. 1. See N°. 416. in the page of the above-quoted Catalogue. Before this manuscript came into the hands of Archbishop Ussher, it had belonged, according to Mill, Prol. § 1460. to a Dr. Goad, (which Wetstein, Prol. p. 52. has converted into Dr. Good) for which Mill quotes the authority of Ussher, 'uti notavit Usserius.' Ussher therefore must have made a memorandum to this purport, in the beginning

ginning of the book, which was observed by Dr. Bulkeley, who communicated the account to Mill: since it does not appear that Usher has given any account of it in print. But there is another part of the history of this manuscript, which is not perfectly clear. Mill is of opinion, (Prol. 1460.) that the manuscript in question came from the hands of this Dr. Goad into the library of Emmanuel College in Cambridge, and that it is the very same as that, which Walton quotes in the sixth volume of the London Polyglot by the abbreviation Em. In this opinion he is followed both by Wettstein, and our author. Now, to prevent mistakes, it is necessary to observe, that the abbreviation Em. in the *Variantes Lectiones Novi Testamenti* in the London Polyglot, does not denote the same thing in the Gospels as in the Epistles. Walton, in his Catalogue of manuscripts prefixed to the *Variantes Lectiones*, mentions a manuscript of the Epistles belonging to Emmanuel Library, which is still preserved there, and has been described above by our author under the title Cant. 3. But Walton very frequently quotes readings from a MS. Em. in the Gospels, and yet takes no notice in his Catalogue of any other than that of the Epistles. Mill, (Prol. § 1460.) on comparing Walton's extracts from the MS. Em. with those which he had received from the Usher. 2. found that they frequently agreed. He conjectured therefore that they were one and the same manuscript, and that the Usher. 2. which was in his time, and is still preserved in Trinity College in Dublin, had formerly belonged to Emmanuel College in Cambridge, and was the first part of a manuscript of the Greek Testament, that of the Epistles, which remains there at present, being the second. This, which Mill gives as mere conjecture, has been converted by Pfaff into matter of fact. In eodem Collegio (sc. Emmanuelis) extant etiam quatuor evangelia nitidissimo charactere descripta, sed haud accurate. Pfaff de var. Nov. Test. lectionibus, cap. v. sect. 4. But, as Pfaff neither had nor could have seen this manuscript, and has evidently copied from Mill, as

appears from his using the same words, it is clear that he has strengthened Mill's expressions, so as to exceed the bounds of truth. It is certain, as I have found on examination, not only that no Greek manuscript of the Gospels is at present in Emmanuel Library, but that no such manuscript ever was there. No article of the kind is to be found in any catalogue belonging to that library, not even in that made in the middle of the last century by the celebrated Barnes, who was many years Fellow of that College: which Catalogue is printed in the *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ in unum collecti*. Oxoniæ 1697, folio. Nor does James, in his *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis*, Londini 1600, 4to. mention, in his Catalogue of manuscripts belonging to Emmanuel College, any one that contains the Gospels. Pfaff's assertion therefore, and Mill's conjecture, are wholly ungrounded. Still further, the premises, on which Mill founded his conclusion, are themselves precarious. For on comparing Walton's extracts from the MS. Em. with those of Mill from the Usher. 2. in the first chapter of St. Matthew alone, I found not only that Walton frequently quotes remarkable readings from the MS. Em. where Mill has none from the Usher. 2. and vice versa, but that Mill quotes $\text{B}\iota\sigma\delta$ as a various reading to $\text{A}\beta\iota\sigma\delta$ from the Usher. 2. where Walton says that it is totally wanting in the MS. Em. It is probable therefore that the MS. Em. and the Usher. 2. denote two distinct manuscripts. Besides, it is wholly inconceivable, that a Greek manuscript of the Gospels, if it once belonged to Emmanuel College, should ever become the property of Usher; for it is not in the power of any learned society to part with treasures of that nature, and a literary theft would have been inconsistent with the character of Usher. Since this note was written, I have met with a book called the "Considerator considered," by Br. Walton, D. D. Lond. 1659, 8vo. In this book, p. 143. Walton says, "As for that MS. of St. Paul's Epistles in Emanuel Colledge, though there was another MS. in the same Colledge, of the Gospels, and Acts, whose
name

name was casually omitted in the Catalogue," &c. and a few lines further, "Those readings of that MS. came to hand after the rest were finished, and after the Catalogue of the MSS. was drawn up ready for the Presse, whereby the name of this MS. was forgotten to be inserted in the Catalogue." It appears then that in Walton's time there actually was a MS. of the Gospels and Acts in Emmanuel College, (perhaps the property of one of the Fellows, as no mention is made of it in any catalogue of MSS. in the College library); but as Walton says that the collation was not sent to him till after the Catalogue of the MSS. (which is prefixed to the Var. Lect. in the last volume of the London Polyglot) was ready for the press, the MS. was probably in Em. College after the death of Usher, and therefore not the same as the Codex Usserii 2.'

CODICES LAURENTII VALLÆ.

PAGE 339.

327. Laurentius Valla, one of the most learned men of the fifteenth century, was born at Placentia in 1407, and died at Rome in 1458. As he has given no description of the manuscripts which he collated, nor distinguished the readings of one manuscript from those of another, it is impossible at present to ascertain them, though they are probably still preserved in some of the libraries of Italy. But whether we discover them or not is of little importance, as the readings which he extracted, which Erasmus published, and which have been inserted in the critical editions of the Greek Testament, are generally such as are found in manuscripts of the least antiquity, and the least value. See Semler's Note 89. to Wetstein's Prolegomena.

328. Laurentinus Valla has quoted no manuscript Matth. v. 22. either for or against the omission of *uxx*. At least Wetstein has quoted none from Valla's collection of various readings.

CODEX VATICANUS.

The most complete catalogue of the Vatican manuscripts is that, which was published by the two Assemani in 1756, in 3 vols. fol. But this work is not to be procured, as almost all the copies were burnt, soon after they were printed, in the fire which consumed a wing of the Vatican. Another, though a much less perfect catalogue, is given in Montfaucon *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 1—155. The most complete description of the celebrated Codex Vaticanus, marked 1209. is given in Birch's *Prolegomena*, p. 13—24.

PAGE 342.

329. When our author wrote this sentence, he had not sufficient data to form a comparison between the readings of the Vaticanus and the Alexandrinus in the New Testament; but since the publication of Professor Birch's Greek Testament, the comparison has been made, and the two manuscripts found to be as different in the New Testament as in the Old. See Note 339.

330. This arrangement is confirmed also by the testimony of Professor Birch, (*Prolegomena*, p. 18, 19.) who thence deduces a conclusion similar to that of our author. *Ex qua numerorum transpositione recte, ut opinor, conjici poterit epistolam ad Hebræos primitus locum obtinuisse inter epistolam ad Galatas, et eam quæ ad Ephesios inscribitur.* It may be also observed, that the subscriptions at the end of St. Paul's epistles differ from those which are found in most other Greek MSS. and which are ascribed to Euthalius. In Birch's *Prol.* p. 17. they are printed in parallel columns, whence it appears that the subscription to the first epistle to the Corinthians, in the Cod. Vat. differs from that of the other Greek manuscripts, even in regard to the place where the Apostle is supposed to have written the epistle, the former having *προς κορινθίους á εγγραφή απο εφισσ,* the latter *προς κορινθίους á εγγραφή απο φιλιππων.*

PAGE 313.

331. Reliqua hujus epistolæ (scil. ad Hebræos, a cap. ix. 14.) pars, una cum Johannis Apocalypsi, a manu recenti ex codice Beffarionis aliquo, ut tradunt, supplentur.

Birch Prol. p. 16.

332. Literæ, non accentus et spiritus atramento interdum obductæ sunt cum antiquior scriptura ætate flavescere incepisset. Quod quo tempore sit factum non constat, summam tamen diligentiam et curam a librario adhibitam fuisse, plura sunt quæ demonstrant. Birch Prol. p. 15. He then gives examples, in which the corrector has introduced readings from other manuscripts, but has still preserved the original text. For instance, the original reading Matth. vii. 14. was *οτι* *σεινη*, but the corrector preferring the reading *τι* *σεινη*, has not retouched the *ο* with fresh ink, like the other letters, and has drawn across it a fine stroke, which leaves the *ο* still visible. He adds however, p. 16. Pauca observavi loca in quibus emendator scalpillo usus est, quo facilius hoc modo codicis lectionem ad suum exemplar conformaret, ut Matth. xiv. 18. ubi a prima manu fuerat *ΚΕΛΕΥCATE*, litera T linea transfigitur, atque ex ultima *Ε* lineola media eraditur, qua correctione effecit *ΚΕΛΕΥCAC*. Our author therefore is not accurate, in describing the later readings, which have been introduced into this manuscript, as if they were noted only in the margin.

333. The Danish title of this publication is *Beskriwelse over Graefke Handskripter of det Nye Testament*.

334. This he has performed in his *Prolegomena*, p. 13—24.

335. In the fac simile published by Blanchini, are neither accents nor marks of aspiration, and Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 3. describes it *Codex Bibliorum Græce, caractere unciali et rotundo, sine accentibus, quinti, sextive sæculi*. But Birch, who has very carefully examined this manuscript, expressly declares that it has both. *Accentus et spiritus,*

tus, quorum ultimi antiquam servant figuram, ab ipsa prima manu literis sunt impositi, quod Blanchinus adnotare neglexit. This indeed is no absolute proof against its antiquity, for on a wall in the ruins of Herculaneum was found a verse of Euripides, written with accents. See *Le pitture antiche d'Ercolano*, Tom. II. p. 34. But, though accents were used by grammarians in the first century, and indeed some time before the Birth of Christ, yet they do not appear to have been introduced into manuscripts of the Greek Testament in general before the seventh century. The most ancient manuscripts of the Greek Testament in uncial letters, and with accents, which Montfaucon has described in his *Palæographia*, are the *Claromontanus*, and *Sangermanensis*; in which accents and spirits are written precisely of the same form, as those which, according to Birch, are in the *Vaticanus*. See the *Palæogr.* p. 216, 219. Moreover, they are only a *secunda manu* in the *Claromontanus*, though a *prima manu* in the *Sangermanensis*. Now as Birch expressly declares that these marks are a *prima manu* in the *Vaticanus*, we might conclude, if we had no other data, that it was not written before the seventh century. On the other hand, though they were not in common use before the seventh century, they were sometimes used in manuscripts of the Greek Testament, even in the fifth century: for Euthalius, who lived in the fifth century, published an edition of St. Paul's epistles, with accents. See Wetstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 73.

PAGE 344.

336. In the *Cod. Alex.* they are also larger, if Blanchini has observed a due proportion in his fac simile of these two manuscripts, in the plates annexed to P. I. p. 492. There is likewise some difference in the formation of the letters, though the difference is not material. The abbreviations in the *Cod. Vat.* are very few, being confined to those words which are in general abbreviated,

ated, such as Θεος, κυριος, ιησους, χριστος, which are written $\overline{\Theta\zeta}$. $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$. $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$. $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$. Nor is any difference observed in the size of the letters, which in other manuscripts are generally larger at the beginning of a section: but in the Cod. Vat. they are all of the same size, except at the beginning of a book. See Birch's Prol. p. 14. This is a proof of very great antiquity.

337. As it appears from a comparison of different Greek inscriptions, that the Greek characters during the six first centuries underwent little alteration, the resemblance between the letters of the Cod. Vat. and those of the pillar of Hippolytus afford no proof, that the manuscript was written in the same century as the inscription, as our author justly observes. For by a similar argument it might be shewn, that the Cod. Vat. was written in the first century, since Birch relates, in his Prol. p. 14. that its characters resemble those of the Greek manuscripts, which have been discovered in the ruins of Herculaneum. On the other hand, these circumstances united afford a very strong presumption, that it was not written later than the sixth century.

PAGE 345.

338. As a division of the Greek Testament into sections is attended with great convenience, and the ancient transcribers in general adopted for that purpose the κεφαλαια and τιτλοι of Eusebius, it is probable that the writer of the Codex Vaticanus would not have been singular in this respect, and that he would have adopted them likewise, if they had been known to him. The omission of them therefore in the Codex Vaticanus, though no proof that it was written before the time of Eusebius, is at least a presumptive argument that it was written before the canons of Eusebius were in general use in the country where the transcriber lived. And by the same mode of reasoning, as was used at the end of Note 122. with respect to the Codex Bezae, we may conclude that the Codex Vaticanus was certainly written before the close of the fifth century.

339. Affirmare non dubito, inter omnes qui hodie extant manuscriptos N. T. codices, vix ullum reperiri, cui eadem tribuenda sit dignitas atque auctoritas, five codices antiquitatem, five ipsam textus indolem spectes. Nullus Origeniano textui propius accedit, et tam multas exhibet lectiones in quibus cum Origene solus convenit. Mira in lectionibus quoque singularibus cernitur convenientia cum Codd. Paris. 9. 62. Cantabrigienſi et illa antiqua Versione Syra, quæ sæculo post C. N. sexto sub auspiciis Philoxeni facta, inſequenti sæculo cura ac studio Thomæ Harclensis ad græcos codices correctæ et perfectæ fuit.

Birch Prolegomena, p. 19.

As the subject here relates to the internal excellence of the Cod. Vat. and the value of its readings, it may not be improper to subjoin a translation of the best critical description which has been hitherto given of this manuscript: for Dr. Semler, in the work which has been frequently quoted, has judiciously avoided an inquiry, for which sufficient materials had not at that time been collected; and our author himself acknowledges that, if he had published his Introduction two years later, he could have communicated more information. This will be amply supplied by the following account, which is taken from a German periodical publication, the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* for 1789, Vol. I. p. 237. It is the result of a very accurate comparison of the readings produced by Birch from the Codex Vaticanus, with those of some of the best Greek manuscripts collated by Wettstein, and others. It discovers the hand of a master in the art of criticism, and though the author is not known to the public, it is not unworthy of the pen of Griesbach.

‘ The Codex Vaticanus has a great resemblance to the manuscripts noted by Wettstein C. D. L. i. 13. 33. 69. 102. and to the Latin, Coptic, and Ethiopic versions; but it is preferable to most of them, in being almost entirely free from those undeniable interpolations, and arbitrary corrections, which are very frequently found in the
above-

above-mentioned manuscripts, especially in D. 1. and 69. It may be applied therefore as a mean not only of confirming their genuine readings, but of detecting and correcting those that are spurious. It is written with great accuracy, and is evidently a faithful copy of the more ancient manuscript, from which it was transcribed. Peculiar readings, or such as are found neither in other manuscripts nor ancient versions, are seldom discovered in the Codex Vaticanus; and of the few which have been actually found, the greatest part are of little importance. But in proportion as the number of such readings is small, the number of those is great, in support of which few only, though ancient authorities, have been hitherto produced. But this manuscript has not throughout the whole N. T. the same uniform text. In the first and greatest part of St. Matthew's Gospel it follows a recension, which is different from that observed in the other Gospels: for in that of St. Matthew, if we except the few last chapters, it approaches nearer to the Cod. D. than to the Codices C. and L. Here it seldom coincides with the two last, where they differ from the first, if we except those particular cases where the Codd. 1. 33. have also the same reading, for then the Cod. Vaticanus accedes in general to these three or four manuscripts. On the other hand, it has in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel a great number of readings which have been hitherto discovered in the Cod. D. alone. It is also very nearly allied to the Cod. 1. and in many paragraphs the alliance is somewhat greater than to the Cod. D. so that a considerable number of the *lectiones singulares* of the Cod. 1. are observed in the Cod. Vaticanus. Next to these manuscripts, it resembles none in a greater degree than the Cod. 33. But in the latter part of St. Matthew it deviates from these, and accedes very sensibly to the Codd. L. and 102. and this is continued as far as the middle of St. Mark's Gospel. During this portion it departs widely from the Cod. D. and coincides in a very remarkable manner either with one or with both of the Codd. L. and 102. in *lectiones singulares*, and even in
their

their very minutiae. But to determine the degree of affinity between the Cod. Vat. and the Cod. L. it is necessary to compare the readings of the former, not only with those which Wettstein has given of the latter, but with the more copious extracts in Griesbach's *Symbolæ Criticæ*. From the middle of St. Mark's Gospel the Cod. 102. is defective; but the agreement between the Codd. Vat. and L. is still continued, and that in so great a degree, that, though the affinity of the Cod. L. to the Cod. C. is very great, its affinity to the Vaticanus is still greater. The same analogy is continued through the Gospel of St. Luke, where the Cod. Vat. and L. almost universally coincide. And as the Codd. D. and 1. agree with the Cod. L. more frequently in this Gospel than in that of St. Mark, their deviation from the Vaticanus is of course less sensible in the former, than in the latter. But even there the characteristic readings of the Cod. D. occur seldom in the Vatican manuscript. Since therefore, as appears from the preceding comparison, the Codd. Vat. and L. were evidently derived from the same source, they may be reciprocally applied in order to correct their mistakes, and to separate the dross from the genuine gold.

With the Cod. A. the Vatican manuscript seldom agrees, and in characteristic readings hardly in any instance, if we except the omission of Luke xxii. 43, 44. where the Vatican deviates from its usual track, and forms an unnatural coalition with the Alexandrine manuscript; but this very circumstance weakens the authority, to which it would be otherwise entitled in regard to this passage.

Lastly, in St. John's Gospel the Vatican text is on the whole similar to that which is found in St. Luke, and its agreement with that of the Cod. L. still great, even in *lectiones singulares*, though not wholly so exact as in this Gospel, and in that of St. Mark. For instance, John v. 4. which relates to the pool of Bethesda, is found in the Cod. L. but omitted by the Vat. in conjunction with Wettstein's Cod. C. Birch's Urbino-vaticanus 2. and 2
Paris

Paris manuscript. And because the Cod. A. and D. agree with L. more frequently in St. John than in the other Gospels, their coincidence with the Vat. is more frequent in the former than in the latter. Sometimes it here agrees with the Codex D. alone, at other times with the common reading, and in many cases it deviates from both.'

N. B. The inquiry has been hitherto confined to the Gospels, because the extracts from the Vatican manuscript in the Acts and the Epistles are not yet published.

PAGE 346.

340. This is one of the sentences which our author wrote when he believed that the Codex Alexandrinus, with many other Greek manuscripts, had been corrupted from the Latin, and which he has neglected to alter since the time that he has changed his sentiments.

PAGE 347.

341. It is wholly impossible that Erasmus, who was well acquainted with Greek manuscripts, could imagine that the Cod. Vat. written in uncial letters, and without intervals, was the produce of the fifteenth century. In a letter to Stunica, in which he quotes it for the omission of 1 John v. 7. he calls it Codex Vetusissimus. See Wettstein's Prol. p. 25. That he spake of it at other times in less favourable and even in dubious terms, is by no means extraordinary, when we recollect the persecution, which he underwent in consequence of the omission of that verse in his two first editions of the Greek Testament. See Note 3. to sect. 3. of this chapter, where an attempt is made to reconcile the contradictions, of which our author complains.

342. These extracts were copied by Woide; and his copy is probably at present in Oxford, as the Synodics of the University Press purchased all Woide's papers. The original of these extracts is now in Trinity College Library.

343. That they not only can, but actually do, vary from

from each other in a very great degree, appears from the description given in Note 339.

PAGE 348.

344. This representation is not perfectly exact: for Bentley did not absolutely refuse to communicate his extracts to Wetstein, who relates, *Prol.* p. 24. that the reason why he could not procure them, was Bentley's absence from Cambridge, during the short stay that he made at that time in England. It does not appear then that a pique against Bentley was the cause of Wetstein's unfavourable opinion of the *Codex Vaticanus*. The true reason was the imperfection and inaccuracy of those extracts, which alone Wetstein had seen, though he concluded too hastily that a more complete collation would confirm the opinion, which the incomplete extracts perhaps warranted. But this is a subject on which the public has been unable to form a judgement before the year 1788, when Birch's edition of the four Gospels was printed.

345. *Tom. I.* p. 329. ed. Boerner. Our author means the Paris edition of 1723.

346. But the alterations which have been occasionally made by a later hand leave the ancient reading distinctly visible. See Birch's *Prolegomena*, p. 15.

PAGE 349.

347. I have collated in several chapters of *St. Matthew* all the extracts which Birch has given from this manuscript alone, with the text of the *Complutensian* edition, and have found the difference to be such as to warrant the conclusion, that it was not used by the editors of that edition. Not to take up too much room, I will subjoin only the collation of the three first chapters, in which I omit those various readings, which consist only in a variation of orthography in proper names.

Cod. Vaticanus 1209. solus.

Editio Complutensis.

- Matth. i. 18. $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\ \iota\eta\varsigma\alpha$ - $\iota\eta\varsigma\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\varsigma.$
 — $\gamma\alpha\rho$ abest - $\gamma\alpha\rho$ adest.
 19. $\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\iota$ - $\omega\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\iota.$
 23. $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ - - - $\omicron\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma.$
 24. $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ - - $\delta\iota\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma.$
 25. $\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu$ - - $\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon.$
 — $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \omega\rho\omega-$ } $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \omega\rho\omega\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu$ adest.
 $\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu$ abest }
 Ch. ii. 8. $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \alpha\kappa-$ } $\alpha\kappa\rho\iota\beta\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\alpha\tau\epsilon.$
 $\rho\iota\beta\omega\varsigma$ - - }
 13. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \chi\omega\rho\alpha\nu$ } $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \chi\omega\rho\alpha\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ abest.
 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ adest }
 15. $\upsilon\pi\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$ - - $\upsilon\pi\omicron\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\varsigma.$
 21. $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ - - $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu.$
 22. $\tau\epsilon\ \omega\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon-$ } $\eta\rho\omega\delta\epsilon\ \tau\epsilon\ \omega\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon.$
 $\tau\epsilon\ \eta\rho\omega\delta\epsilon$ - }
- Ch. iii. 2. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ abest - - $\kappa\alpha\iota$ adest.
 3. $\delta\iota\alpha$ - - - $\upsilon\pi\omicron.$
 4. $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \eta\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ - $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \eta\nu.$
 7. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ abest - $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ adest.
 10. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ prius abest $\kappa\alpha\iota$ prius adest.
 11. $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega$ $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega\ \upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma.$
 12. $\alpha\pi\omicron\theta\eta\kappa\eta\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\alpha\pi\omicron\theta\eta\kappa\eta\nu.$
 14. $\iota\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$ abest - $\iota\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$ adest.
 15. $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ - - $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\ \omega\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu.$
 16. $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon$ - $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma.$
 — $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ abest - - $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ adest.
 — $\omega\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\epsilon$ - - $\omega\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\epsilon.$
 — $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ultimum } $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ultimum adest.
 abest - - }

The preceding comparison affords an absolute demonstration that the Codex Vaticanus 1209. was not once consulted in this part of the Greek Testament by the Complutensian editors, for I have omitted not a single reading that is peculiar to this manuscript, yet not one
of

of them is found in the Complutensian edition. Now as this manuscript is of the highest antiquity, and of the greatest authority, it is incredible, if the Complutensian editors had it really in their hands, that they should have totally neglected it in three whole chapters immediately following each other; and we have reason to conclude, that if Vatican manuscripts were sent to them, this was not in the number. To obviate the objection which might be made on the supposition that the Codex Vaticanus 1209. might have arrived after a part of the Greek Testament was already printed, I have collated the last chapter of St. John; but there the difference is still greater than at the beginning, for in that chapter alone Birch has quoted not less than twenty-eight readings from this manuscript, yet not one of them is to be discovered in the Complutensian edition.

PAGE 350.

348. Since the publication of this Introduction, Bentley's extracts, as far as relates to the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, have been inserted in Birch's edition of the four Gospels, Woide having sent a copy for that purpose to Copenhagen. See Birch's Prol. p. 24. See also Note 342.

PAGE 351.

349. As the first volume of this valuable work is now published, it is necessary to supply what our author was unable to communicate, and to give at least a catalogue of those Vatican manuscripts, which Professor Birch has collated, and described in his Prolegomena to Vol. I. p. 3—33. For more ample information recourse must be had to the work itself; for a transcript of the whole would not only be too voluminous, but unnecessary, as the original is accessible to every reader. But as our author gives in this chapter a catalogue of all the manuscripts which had been at that time collated, it is not improper to enumerate those, which have been made known within the last three years, in order that the whole number of collated manuscripts

manuscripts may be exactly ascertained. For the above-mentioned reason I have not distinguished those, which Professor Birch has completely collated, from those which he has cursorily inspected, or only examined for particular passages: this information can interest those only who examine the readings which he quotes, and this implies the possession of the book itself. He divides them into four classes. 1. Cod. Vatican. 2. Palatino-Vatican. 3. Alexandrino-Vatican. 4. Urbino-Vatican. He has arranged them in his Prolegomena, and also quoted them among the various readings, according to the numbers which are affixed to them in the Vatican. The cyphers, which are prefixed to them in the following list, serve only to number them, and have no reference to the work itself. The two which our author has described I have not numbered.

CODICES VATICANI.

1. Codex Vaticanus 349. membranaceus, sæculi xi vel xii. continet quatuor Evangelia.

2. Cod. Vaticanus 351. membranaceus sæculo x. vel xi. caractere unciali exaratus complectitur lectiones Evangeliorum.

3. Cod. Vaticanus 354. membranaceus quatuor continet Evangelia literis uncialibus scripta.

4. Cod. Vaticanus 356. membranaceus sæculo xi. ut conjicio exaratus quatuor complectitur Evangelia.

5. Cod. Vaticanus 358. membranaceus sæculo, ut conjicio xii. exaratus, continet iv. Evangelia cum scholiis variorum in margine.

6. Cod. Vaticanus 359. chartaceus Græco-latinus, quatuor complectitur Evangelia.

7. Cod. Vaticanus 360. membranaceus sæculi xi. integrum N. T. complectitur præter Apocalypsin.

8. Cod. Vaticanus 361. membranaceus sæculo, ut videtur, xi. exaratus complectitur quatuor Evangelia.

9. Cod. Vaticanus 363. membranaceus sæculo, ut
Vol. II. F f f opinor,

opinor, xi. exaratus, continet quatuor Evangelia, Acta Apostolorum, epistolas catholicas et Pauli.

10. Cod. Vaticanus 364. sæculo, ut arbitror, xi. in membranis scriptus habet quatuor Evangelia.

11. Cod. Vaticanus 365. membranaceus sæculi, ut conjicio, xi. continet quatuor Evangelia.

12. Cod. Vaticanus 665. sæculo xiii. in charta bombycina scriptus complectitur Matthæi et Marci Evangelia cum Euthymii commentario.

13. Cod. Vaticanus 756. membranaceus continet iv. Evangelia cum commentariis Patrum in margine. Scriptus videtur sæculo xi. vel xii.

14. Cod. Vaticanus 757. membranaceus continet quatuor, Evangelia cum commentariis Origenis, Gregorii Thaumaturgi, Apollinarii, Cyrilli, et aliorum.

15. Cod. Vaticanus 758. membranaceus habet Evangelia Lucæ et Johannis, cum Patrum variorum commentariis.

16. Cod. Vaticanus 1067. membranaceus caractere unciali sæculo, ut opinor xi. exaratus continet lectiones Evangeliorum usui ecclesiastico distributorum.

17. Cod. Vaticanus 1158. membranaceus sæculo, ut conjicio xi. eleganter exaratus, a Cypri regina Innocentio VII. R. P. dono oblatus complectitur quatuor Evangelia.

18. Cod. Vaticanus 1160. in membranis sæculo, ut arbitror, xi. exaratus, integrum N. T. continet.

Cod. Vaticanus 1209. Veteris Novique Testamenti. Vid. supra, N°. 253.

19. Cod. Vaticanus 1210. membranaceus sæculo, si recte colligo, xi. scriptus integrum N. T. complectitur, excepta Apocalypsi, adjecto Davidis Psalterio.

20. Cod. Vaticanus 1229. membranaceus sæculo, ut videtur, xi. exaratus continet quatuor Evangelia, cum Patrum commentariis in margine.

21. Cod. Vaticanus 1254. membranaceus sæculi xi. complectitur quatuor Evangelia.

22. Cod. Vaticanus 1548. membranaceus continet Evangelia Lucæ et Johannis.

CODICES PALATINO-VATICANI.

23. Cod. Palatino-Vaticanus 5. membranaceus sæculo ut videtur XII. exaratus continet Evangelia Matthæi et Marci, cum Patrum commentariis in margine.

24. Cod. Palatino-Vaticanus 89. membranaceus sæculo, ut conjicio, XI. exaratus quatuor Evangelia complectitur cum menologio.

25. Cod. Palatino-Vaticanus 136. membranaceus sæculi XI. vel XII. quatuor continet Evangelia.

Codex Palatino-Vaticanus 171. membranaceus integrum N. T. complectitur. Vid. supra, N°. 255.

26. Cod. Palatino-Vaticanus 189. membranaceus sæculo undecimo exaratus quatuor continet Evangelio.

27. Cod. Palatino-Vaticanus 189. membranaceus sæculi, ut videtur XI. quatuor continet Evangelia, cum scholiis Patrum in margine.

28. Cod. Palatino-Vaticanus 227. membranaceus, et sæculo, ut videtur XI. exaratus, continet quatuor Evangelia.

29. Cod. Palatino-Vaticanus 229. in charta bombycina sæculo, ut puto, XII. exaratus, complectitur quatuor Evangelia.

CODICES ALEXANDRINO-VATICANI.

30. Cod. Alexandrino-Vaticanus 28. in charta bombycina scriptus non ultra sæculum XIII. assurgere videtur: continet quatuor Evangelia cum commentariis Theophylacti.

31. Cod. Alexandrino-Vaticanus 79. membranaceus sæculo, ut conjicio, undecimo exaratus, complectitur quatuor Evangelia.

32. Codex Alexandrino-Vaticanus 189. membranaceus complectitur quatuor Evangelia.

CODICES URBINO-VATICANI.

33. Codex Urbino-Vaticanus 2. membranaceus quatuor complectitur Evangelia: nitide et eleganter exaratus est. Scriptus videtur in usus Johannis II. Imperatoris Orientis, qui Alexio anno 1118. in imperio successit.

34. Codex Urbino-Vaticanus 53. scriptus est in membranis caractere unciali sæculi XI. et quatuor Evangelia complectitur.

The description of the manuscripts, containing the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation, is not yet published.

CODICES VELESIANI.

PAGE 352.

350. We may rather conclude, from the examples produced by our author, that Velez used Latin manuscripts and translated the readings which he quoted from them into Greek.

PAGE 354.

351. Though our author has here endeavoured to confute the opinion of Wetstein, and to shew that the lectiones Velebianæ are not Greek translations of Latin readings, but that they were actually derived from Grecian sources, yet whoever impartially weighs what Wetstein has said on this subject in his Prol. p. 59—61. will be more inclined to favour his sentiments, than those of our author. The few examples, which have been given by the latter to shew that the Lectiones Velebianæ differ sometimes both from the Vulgate and the Latin manuscripts published by Blanchini, are more than counterbalanced by the numerous and undeniable instances produced by Wetstein of translations from the Latin. For the circumstance, that a few of these readings are to be found in no Latin manuscript hitherto collated, is of little consequence in deciding the question; since the collation has been confined to a very inconsiderable number, and not one has been either published or examined among those,

those, which are preserved in the libraries of Spain, where Velez resided, in which it is not impossible that those lectiones Veleſianæ might be discovered, which are sought in vain in the manuscripts of Sabatier and Blanchini. Besides, Velez himself has nowhere declared that they were taken from Greek manuscripts, which is a mere conjecture of Mariana: Velez has observed a profound silence on the subject, and this very silence is an argument in favour of Wettstein, for as the intention of the Spanish critic was evidently to support the readings of the Latin, he would hardly have neglected to note in the copy of the Greek Testament, in which he wrote them, that they were taken from Greek originals. Bengel considered these readings as of no value, and Michaelis, the father of our author, says in his *Tractatio critica*, p. 97. in Veleſianis transparenere Vulgatam, ita quidem ut in plerisque se prodant inconsultum et adfectatum Veleſianorum librorum in conformandis Latinæ versioni Græcis studium. And Griesbach, in the preface to his *Gr. Test.* p. 30. says, *Lectiones Veleſianæ, e latinis codicibus collectæ, et græcis vocabulis expressæ.* Our author therefore has augmented his catalogue of Greek manuscripts by the addition of sixteen, which probably never existed.

CODICES VENETIANI.

The manuscripts preserved in the different libraries in Venice are enumerated in *Montſaucon Bibliotheca bibliothecarum*, Tom. I. p. 467—483.

Professor Birch in his *Prolegomena*, p. 55, 56. has described the following manuscripts preserved in the library of St. Mark in Venice. He has not completely collated them, but examined them only in select passages.

1. Codex 5. sæculo xv. Bessarionis jussu exaratus, membranaceus, Vet. et Nov. Testamentum complectitur.

2. Codex 6. partim in membranis, partim in charta scriptus est, sæculi xv. continetque Vet. et Nov. Testamentum.

3. Codex 8. membranaceus, sæculi circiter x. habet quatuor Evangelia.

4. Codex 9. membranaceus sæculi ut videtur xi, quatuor Evangelia complectitur.

5. Codex 10. membranaceus, sæculi xv. integrum N. T. complectitur. Primo loco ponuntur Acta Apostolorum, et Epistolæ omnes, sequuntur Evangelia, quibus Apocalypsis a diversa manu scripta subjungitur.

6. Codex 27. membranaceus, sæculi x. quatuor Evangelia complectitur cum patrum commentariis in margine.

7. Codex 539. membranaceus, sæculi xii. quatuor Evangelia continet græce et arabice.

8. Codex 540. membranaceus, sæculo xii. exaratus, complectitur quatuor Evangelia.

9. Codex 542. membranaceus, sæculi xi. habet quatuor Evangelia.

10. Codex 543. chartaceus, sæculi xiv. quatuor Evangelia, complectitur cum synaxario.

11. Codex 544. membranaceus, sæculi xi. continet quatuor Evangelia cum commentariis Patrum.

CODICES VINDOBONENSES.

PAGE 354.

A very full account of the manuscripts preserved in the imperial library at Vienna is given in the following work, P. Lambecii *Commentariorum de augustissima bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonensi libri octo*. Vindobonæ, 1665—1679. 8 tom. folio. A new and improved edition of it was published by Kollar in 1766—1782, likewise at Vienna.

352. Our author describes this MS. by the name of Vindobonensis 3. but for what reason I know not, as no number is affixed to it, either by Mill or Wetstein. Now as the Vienna MSS. are usually quoted by the numbers affixed to them in the Commentaries of Lambecius, where this manuscript is noted Codex 2. and described Lib. III. p. 2—15. I have taken the liberty to alter our author's notation to Vindobonensis 2. Besides, the manuscript

manuscript in question is quoted by Alter as the Codex Lambecii 2.

353. Our author should rather have said, how did Lambecius know this, for Wettstein only quotes the words of Lambecius. Compare Wettstein's Proleg. p. 41. with Lambecii Commentarii de bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonensis, Lib. III. p. 15. Now Lambecius was certainly able to determine, whether these points were a *prima manu*, or not.

N. B. Whenever I quote the Commentaries of Lambecius, I mean the original edition of 1665—1679.

354. The German title of this work is Michaelis Erklärung der Begräbnis- und Auferstehungs-Geschichte nach den vier Evangelisten. Halle 1783. In the place to which he refers, he describes two different towns of the name of Emmaus, the one sixty, the other an hundred and sixty stadia from Jerusalem, and shews that St. Luke meant the former.

355. Our author acknowledges then that *εκατον εξηκοντα* is not the genuine reading, and yet censures those who are of the same opinion.

356. The fac simile is in the second plate annexed to p. 492. But Treschow in his Tentamen, p. 124. says, Specimina characteris Græci nobis exhibent Lambecius, Montefalconius, et Blanchinus, duo posteriores vero parum accurate. See therefore the fac simile given by Lambecius, Lib. III. p. 14. The fac simile, which is given by Montfaucon, is p. 194. of the Palæographia Græca.

357. The readings of this fragment are given in Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. I. p. 999—1001.

PAGE 355.

358. The description which Wettstein gives of this manuscript is as follows: Contulit cum editis Gerhardus a Mastricht, syndicus Bremensis, ad Imperatorem legatus A°. 1690, unde apographum nactus Millius appendici suæ inseruit sub titulo Viennensis, in editione vero Wettsteiniana 1711 vocatur Cæsareus. Postea G. a Mastricht

fff 4

accuratiorem

accuratiorem hujus Codicis collationem communicavit cum H. Wetstenio, qui eam margini editionis suæ adscripsit, unde et multos typographi in exprimendis hujus codicis lectionibus errores correxi, et non paucas in editione vel studio vel incuria omiffas varias lectiones descripti. Wetstenii Prol. p. 54.

359. At present we have very complete extracts from his MS. in Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. I. p. 375—413. and Vol. II. p. 631—688.

360. Extracts from this MS. have been also given by Alter, Vol. I. p. 323—374.

PAGE 356.

361. From the Codex Lambecii 1. or, which is the same, the Codex Nesselii 23. Professor Alter has printed his Greek Testament which was published at Vienna in two Vols. 8vo. in 1786 and 1787. He has no where departed from the text of this manuscript, except where it had manifest errata, which he has corrected from the text of Stephens's edition of 1546, but he has noted these errata at the end of each volume, as he says p. 6. of his preface, ut codicem Vindobonensem, uti est, lectoribus integrum exhiberem. Beside the chasm, Rev. xx. 7. to the end, which our author has noted from Wetstein, it appears from Alter's preface, p. 4, 5. that there are likewise the three following chasms in the book of Revelation, ch. xiii. 5.—xiv. 8. xv. 7.—xvii. 2. xviii. 10.—xix. 15. Alter has supplied these chasms from the Codex Nesselii 302. Some extracts from this MS. are given by Birch, who says p. 58. of his Prolegomena, Hunc codicem iis in locis examinavimus, ubi a textu recepto libri manuscripti variare solent.

362. Wetstein neither has nor could have quoted this manuscript Matth. vi. 13. for he has given no extracts from it in the Gospels. He has noted it only in the catalogue of manuscripts prefixed to St. Paul's epistles, but even here I have never found a quotation from it, not even Rom. xiv. 23. where he quotes not less than forty-seven manuscripts in support of a very remarkable reading

ing which is likewise confirmed, as appears from Alter's edition, by the Codex Lambecii 1. the manuscript in question.

363. The Codex Lambecii 1. does not omit this passage at the end of both chapters. See Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. II. p. 132. where it appears that the passage is at the end of ch. xiv. Our author in writing this note must have forgotten an error, which he himself had corrected in the place to which he refers. See Note 12. to ch. vi. sect. 10.

364. Our author in his Orient. Bib. Vol. VI. p. 19. observes, that the examples which Treschow has produced from this manuscript, were not sufficient to shew that this manuscript had been altered from the Latin. But Treschow himself says only (*Tentamen*, p. 60.) *Quibusdam in locis hunc codicem a versione Latinâ interpolatum fuisse suspicor*; and adds in the following page, *Nec tamen prætereundum esse censeo codicem nostrum aliis in locis a versione latina valde discrepare*.

PAGE 357.

365. Here is only an extract from Treschow's *Tentamen descriptionis codicum Vindobonensium*, but the reader will find a more complete description in the work itself, p. 62—73. This manuscript is described also in *Lambecii Commentarii*, Lib. III. p. 48—57. Extracts from this manuscript are given in Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. II. p. 415—558.

366. The Codex Lambecii 35. is described in Treschow's *Tentamen*, p. 73—76. and complete extracts are given from it in Alter's Greek Test. Vol. II. p. 741—788.

367. The Codex Lambecii 36. is described in Treschow's *Tentamen*, p. 76—79. and *Lambecii Commentarii*, Lib. III. p. 58. Complete extracts are given from it in Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. II. p. 789—853.

368. The Codex Lambecii 37. is described in Treschow's *Tentamen*, p. 79. and *Lambecii Commentarii*, Lib. III. p. 58. Complete extracts are given from it in Alter's Greek Testament, Vol. II. p. 689—740.

369. To

369. To the Codices Vindobonenses enumerated by our author, may be added the following, which have been very accurately collated by Alter, and of which the extracts may be found in the parts of his Greek Test. to which reference will be made. I omit those which have been already mentioned, as well in the notes immediately preceding, as also in the Notes 165. 234.

1. Codex Lambecii 33. Nessëlii 337. a manuscript of the four Gospels written in small letters in the 14th century, Vol. I. p. 414—464.

2. Codex in Kollarii supplementis 9. in Forlosiæ Auc-tario 31. a manuscript of the four Gospels written in 1192, Vol. I. p. 528—635. See Treschow's Tentamen, p. 90.

3. Codex in Kollarii supplementis 16. in Forlosiæ Auc-tario 6. a manuscript containing the four Gospels, and not written before the tenth century, though attested by three Italian Archbishops to have been written thirty years after Christ's ascension, Vol. I. p. 636—703. See Treschow's Tentamen, p. 41—48. 108—123. Treschow calls this manuscript Codex Carolinus, because it was formerly in the private library of Charles VI.

4. Codex Lambecii 30. Nessëlii 240. a manuscript of the four Gospels, supposed to have been written in the 11th century, and brought by Busbeek from Constantinople. Vol. I. p. 807—880. See Treschow's Tentamen, p. 32—34. and Lambecii Commentarii, Lib. III. p. 47.

5. Codex Lambecii 31. Nessëlii 188. a manuscript of the four Gospels. Vol. I. p. 881—998. Treschow, in his Tentamen, p. 34—41. has given an accurate description of this manuscript, from which it appears to be of very great importance. It agrees with the Cod. Cant. in not less than 80 unusual readings, with the Cod. Ephrem in upwards of 35. with the Stephani in 50. with the Cod. Reuchlini in upwards of 50. and has several which are found in that manuscript alone, with the Cod. Regius 2244. in 60 unusual readings, and with the Cod. Colb. 2844. in 22.

6. Codex

6. Codex Lambecii 15. Nessellii 5. a fragment of an Evangelistarium, consisting only of six leaves. Vol. I. p. 1002—1007. It must be observed, that the Codex Lambecii 15. is not the manuscript that is thus numbered in the third book of the Commentaries of Lambecius where the Codices Theologici are enumerated, for there Cod. 15. is a commentary on several parts of the Old Testament; but it is a Codex juridicus 15. at the end of which are the fragments in question.

7. Codex Lambecii 32. Nessellii 321. a manuscript of the four Gospels. Vol. II. p. 1012—1054.

8. Codex in Auctario Forlosiæ 30. in supplementis Kollarii 8. a manuscript of St. Matthew's Gospel. Vol. I. p. 1055—1068. See Treschow's Tentamen, p. 89.

9. Codex purpureus aureus, in Auctario Forlosiæ 23. in supplementis Kollarii 7. an Evangelistarium written in uncial letters. Vol. I. p. 1069—1078. See Treschow's Tentamen, p. 91—107.

10. Codex in Auctario Forlosiæ 19. in supplementis Kollarii 10. contains all the epistles of St. Paul, except those to Titus and Philemon. Vol. II. p. 854—920.

11. Codex Lambecii 248. Nessellii 307. a manuscript containing, beside several works of the Greek fathers, the Revelation of St. John with a marginal commentary of Andreas Cæsareensis, Vol. II. p. 921—940. It is described in Lambecii Commentarii, Lib. V. p. 134—141.

12. Codex in Auctario Forlosiæ 29. in supplementis Kollarii 26. a manuscript of the Revelation with the commentary of Andreas Cæsareensis. It is defective from ch. xix. 20. to the end. Vol. II. p. 941—967.

Of these twelve manuscripts, the 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, are likewise quoted by Birch. See his Prolegomena, p. 57—60. Of the rest which he has examined and quoted, the Cod. Lambecii 1. the Cod. Kollarii 4. which is the same as the Cod. Parrhasii and the Cod. Kollarii 6. have been already mentioned; there remain therefore to be noted,

13. Codex Lambecii 38. Nessellii 337. a manuscript of the four Gospels, with commentaries of the fathers in the margin.

14. Codex

14. Codex Lambecii 39. Neffellii 180. contains several passages of the Gospels, with commentaries.

15. Codex Lambecii 40. Neffellii 301. contains select passages from the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, with commentaries of the fathers.

Lambecius has described these three MSS. Lib. III. p. 59, 60. he relates of all three that they contain commentaries of the Gospels, and makes no mention of the text. But as Birch is very circumstantial in saying of the first, that the commentaries are written in the margin, no doubt can be made that his account is exact.

CODICES WAKIANI.

PAGE 358.

370. Of the four manuscripts formerly in the possession of Archbishop Wake, and at present in the library of Christ Church, our author calls the two first Codices Wakiani, the two last Codex Wakii 1. and Codex Wakii 2. To prevent mistakes therefore, it is necessary to observe, that he has here inverted the names which are given them in Wetstein's and Griesbach's catalogue, where Cod. Wakii 1. and Cod. Wakii 2. denote those which he calls simply Codices Wakiani, without affixing to them any number.

CODICES WHEELERIANI.

371. The manuscripts, which formerly belonged to Dr. Wheeler, are described in the Catalogi MStorum Angliæ, et Hiberniæ in unum collecti, Tom. II. P. I. p. 357. and it appears from the last page of the preface to this work, that they are at present preserved in the library of Lincoln College in Oxford.

372. Griesbach has quoted for this reading five manuscripts of what is called the old Latin version.

CODEx

CODEX WESTMONASTERIENSIS.

PAGE 359.

373. The Codex Bibliothecæ Regiæ Westmonasteriensis 953. is at present in the British Museum, where all the manuscripts that formerly belonged to his Majesty's library are deposited. It is noted among the manuscripts brought from the King's library I. B. I.

CODEX WINCHELSEANUS.

374. I know not where De Missy's copy is at present, but Jackson's autograph of the extracts, which he had made from the Codex Winchelseanus, is now preserved in the library of Jesus College in Cambridge, where it is marked O, Θ, 3.

375. Wetstein quotes the Coptic for the same reading.

CODICES WOLFII.

PAGE 361.

376. Of the first of these three Codices Wolfii Griesbach relates, in his *Symbolæ criticæ*, p. lxiv. that though written in uncial letters, it has accents and marks of aspiration. He judges from the oblong form of the letters, that it was not written before the tenth century. It was examined by Griesbach in the British Museum; but he has not mentioned whether the other two manuscripts, which belonged to Mr. Wolf of Hamburg, are likewise preserved there.

CODEX ZELADÆ.

A manuscript of the four Gospels, supposed to be written in the eleventh century, and at present the property of Cardinal Zelada, has been examined in particular passages by Professor Birch. See his *Prolegomena*, p. 50.

Recapi-

Recapitulation of the manuscripts of the Greek Testament, either wholly or partially collated, which have been mentioned in these Notes, in addition to those described by our author.

Codices Barberiniani	-	-	10
Codices Sti Basilii Romæ	-	-	4
Codex Bononiensis	-	-	1
Codices Borgiani	-	-	3
Codex Cromwelli	-	-	1
Codices Escorialenses	-	-	12
Codices Florentini	-	-	24
Codices Harleiani	-	-	6
Codex Manheimensis	-	-	1
Codices Stæ Mariæ in Vallicella	-	-	4
Codices Marshi	-	-	2
Codices Mosquenses	-	-	44
Codices Seldeni	-	-	2
Cod. Regius 1886 ² . at present 60.	-	-	1
Codex Upsalensis	-	-	1
Codices Vaticani	-	-	34
Codices Veneriani	-	-	11
Codices Vindobonenses	-	-	15
Codex Zeladæ	-	-	1
			<hr/>
			177
MSS. described by our author	-	-	292
			<hr/>

Total of the manuscripts of the Greek Testament, which have been wholly or partially collated } 469

In Dr. Griesbach's new edition of the Greek Testament, which is now ready for the press, all these manuscripts will probably be quoted.

377. This task has been in a great measure executed by Wettstein, as far as relates to the manuscripts which he has collated, for he has prefixed to each of the four parts of his Greek Testament, a catalogue of the manuscripts which contain those respective parts, has noted the

the chasms as far as they were known to him, and has in general given such accounts of them, that we may judge of the degree of diligence and care that has been used in collating them.

378. As this paragraph appeared in our author's third edition, published in 1777, and the questions, which he proposed, he has left unanswered after an interval of ten years, though continually engaged in comparing the different readings of the Greek Testament, the translator must decline the inquiry, as not having sufficient experience in this subject. One material difference however I have observed, between four manuscripts brought from Greece, two of which came immediately from mount Athos, noted by Wetstein 38. 40. 73. 74. and the Moscow manuscripts collated by Matthäi. Namely, these four manuscripts contain the story of the adulteress John vii. 53—viii. 11. but it is omitted in all the Moscow manuscripts, which have the text without scholia, as appears from Matthäi Evangelium Johannis, p. 359. It has been observed, Note 7. to ch. vii. sect. 37. that the text of Theophylact differs from the Slavonian version as often as it agrees with it: this remark was made on the authority of Dobrowsky, who can best determine on which side the manuscripts in question preponderate.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the Quotations from the New Testament in the works of ecclesiastical writers.

PAGE 363.

I. It does not appear that the reading *ἐν Ἡσραὶ τῷ προφῆτῃ* is erroneous, though not that of the common printed text. Griesbach has taken it into the text of his edition, and seemingly with reason, for it is supported by the authority of the Vaticanus, Cantabrigienfis, Stephani 7, Codex Reuchlini, Colbertinus 2844, and

and several other Greek manuscripts, as also by that of the Old Syriac, the margin of the New Syriac, the Arabic of Erpenius, both Persian versions, the Coptic, Armenian, the old Italic, the Gothic, and the Vulgate. It is quoted by Origen four times, by Irenæus in one instance, by Porphyry, by Jerom, and several other Latin fathers. Our author observes, in his note at the bottom of the page, that five of the manuscripts, which have the reading, are supposed to latinize. Now this note appeared in the third edition of his Introduction, but he should have altered it in the fourth, because he acknowledges that the charge laid against the four first of these MSS. is ungrounded.

PAGE 364.

2. Dr. Semler, in his 179th. Note to Wettstein's Prolegomena, recommends another source of various readings, the Concilia Græca.

PAGE 365.

3. Griesbach on the other hand seems inclined to reject it.

PAGE 368.

4. Apparatus criticus, p. 49. ed. 2da.

PAGE 369.

5. The Cod. Cant. is the only manuscript quoted by Wettstein, but Griesbach found the same transposition in the Cod. Colb. 2844.

PAGE 370.

6. It is probably a mistake when our author says that • λυει is found in Origen, for Griesbach, who has very accurately collated the works of this father, declares expressly, in his note to this passage, *Lectio recepta* (scil. ο μη ομολογει) extat in codicibus græcis omnibus, et patribus græcis omnibus. With respect to the authenticity
of

of the reading which our author prefers, see Note 11. to chap. vi. sect. 9.

7. When a Greek father quotes a passage as taken immediately from the Greek Testament, it seems to be of no importance whether he comments upon it or not, as far as relates to the question, with which alone we are at present concerned, 'What was the reading of his manuscript, or manuscripts?' At the same time it must be acknowledged, that the evidence is stronger, where the quotation is attended with a commentary, in which the words of the text are repeated, because in that case there is not only an accession of evidence arising from the commentary itself, but the evidence of the one is confirmed by that of the other: except when they disagree, in which case the evidence of the commentary is perhaps superior to that of the text, as far as relates to the omission of words; for if a word omitted in the quoted text is explained in the commentary, we may conclude that it was omitted in the text by mere accident.

PAGE 371.

8. The omission of *υμων* after *διπλοτερον* by Justin Martyr, decides neither for nor against the common reading, for the passage here quoted from the Greek father is so constructed, that the insertion of *υμων* would make it absolute nonsense. The turn of expression in the whole sentence differs entirely from that which we find in St. Matthew, and the former can by no means be considered as a quotation from the latter. With respect to Justin's quotations in general, see Note 4. to ch. ii. sect. 6. where it is shewn that Justin probably quoted, not from our four canonical Gospels, but from the Gospel of the Nazarenes, which, during the first century, and the former part of the second, was in common use among the Christians of the East, and which, even in the fourth century, was thought by Jerom to be of so much importance, that he translated it into Latin. The difference therefore between Justin's quotations and

the text of the four Gospels, cannot be alleged as an argument in favour of the opinion, that the ancient fathers were negligent and inaccurate in their quotations, because Justin did not quote from them, but from the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and with this Gospel his quotations might perfectly agree.

PAGE 372.

9. Radicitus ex animo evellenda est præjudicata multorum opinio, qui e patrum allegationibus certo cognosci posse negant, quid in suis codicibus scriptores illi legerint, nec ne. Etsi enim lubentissime concedo scripturæ sacræ loca a patribus sæpe excitari negligenter, nec codicibus inspectis, sed memoriter atque confuse: extant tamen criteria sat multa atque luculenta, quorum ope discerni possunt allegationes fideliter e codicibus depromptæ a vagis ad dicta scripturæ provocationibus, in quibus patres vel propter memoriæ lapsum, vel ex oscitantia nimiaque festinatione, vel etiam de industria scriptorum sacrorum verba paullulum inflexerunt immutaruntque. Ac si vel maxime ad liquidum res non semper deduci possit, judicari tamen ex istis criteriis potest, utrum absque erroris metu allegationem quandam pro certa et accurata habere, et in delineanda sacri textus historia tuto ea uti queamus, an vero in dubio res relinquenda sit: id quod consilio nostro abunde sufficit.

Griesbachii Hist. textus Ep. Paulin. sect. 1. § 13.

The criteria, of which Griesbach here speaks, he has explained in his *Dissertatio de codicibus Evangeliorum Origenianis*, Halæ 1771, p. 36—50. See also Wetstenii *Animadversiones et cautiones*, sect. 14.

PAGE 374.

10. The Greek words, John xx. 17. are λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησὺς, μὴ μὲ ἀπτε. What mistake then has Epiphanius here committed?

PAGE 377.

11. I know not whether Ephrem understood Hebrew, but

but he certainly understood Greek, for his life has been written by a Syrian historian, who expressly relates that Ephrem was instructed in Greek by Basilus, the bishop who ordained him deacon. See *Affemani Bibl. Orient.* Tom. I. p. 44.

PAGE 380.

12. Our author delivers in his *Orient. Bibl.* Vol. VIII. p. 153. the same rules, as in this part of his Introduction.

13. Mill's *Prolegomena*, § 608—1079. *Wetstenii Prolegomena*, p. 65—79. Much valuable information on this subject may likewise be derived from Simon *histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament*.

PAGE 381.

14. This very example is a proof that Porphyry did not quote from the Syriac version, unless we suppose that the Syriac, as well as the Greek text, was altered in consequence of his objection. But it cannot be inferred, with any certainty, from his objection, that a Syriac version of the Greek Testament at that time existed; nor is it probable that a writer, who was master of the Greek, and who wrote not to edify an illiterate congregation, but addressed his arguments to the most learned among the Christians, would have had recourse to a translation, though the translation had been established by the church of his country. With respect to the other example, *εν Ησαια*, Mark i. 2. we must not forget, that though it was the reading of the Syriac version, it is the reading likewise of several Greek manuscripts, though our author says that their number is small. But as the *Codex Vaticanus*, *Cantabrigienfis*, *Stephani* η, and *Codex Reuchlini*, are in the number of those, which have *εν Ησαια*; as the same reading is found in the Coptic, the Armenian, the Vulgate, the old Italic, and the Gothic; and as it is quoted by Irenæus, Origen, and Jerom, it was probably the reading of the Greek MSS. in general in the time

of Porphyry. It affords therefore no presumption whatsoever, that Porphyry quoted from the Syriac version. In fact, no evidence, either historical or critical, has hitherto been produced, sufficient to warrant the opinion that a Syriac version at that time existed. See the Notes to ch. vii. § 6. of this Introduction.

PAGE 382.

15. Wetstein actually quotes in this verse Tertullianus de carne Christi, c. 19.

16. In those examples, in which Wetstein does not quote the particular book or page of a Greek father, the reader may generally discover them himself. When he quotes Theophylact, for instance, without any further reference, it is as easy to find the place in his commentary, as the passage in the Bible, because it is continued with the text in an uninterrupted series.

CHAPTER X.

Conjectural Emendations of the Greek Testament.

PAGE 390.

1. It does not appear to have been Wetstein's meaning, that the same liberties in regard to critical conjecture, in which the first editors of the Greek Testament indulged themselves, might be taken by a critic of the eighteenth century, for Wetstein has not admitted into the text of his edition any conjectures whatsoever; though he has frequently quoted them in his notes. The meaning of this critic was, that as Stephens departed from the text of Erasmus, Beza from the text of Stephens, and the Elzevir editors again from Beza, so it was allowable for a critic in the present age to alter the readings of the text which is now in common use, wherever they can be shewn, by a decided majority of evidence

evidence from the Greek manuscripts, the Greek fathers, and the ancient versions, to be spurious. The truth of this assertion is not to be doubted, for if a passage is not authentic in itself, it acquires no prerogative by length of time, or by having been printed in a thousand editions, between the year 1514 and the close of the eighteenth century. See Wetstein's N. T. Vol. II. p. 852. and the preface to the second volume of Griesbach's N. T. p. 13.

PAGE 391.

2. But though Wetstein defends the right of critical conjecture, he recommends great caution in the application of it: and says, Vol. II. p. 858. 'Quicquid autem sit de asserti nostri metaphysica veritate, illud saltem de momento ejus moneo, nemini inde magnum periculum imminere; licet enim plerasque omnes, quas vidi, et in V. L. exposui, conjecturas doctas atque ingeniosas existimem, neque proinde studium cujusquam vituperem, ingenue tamen fateor, *ex omnibus illis vix unam aut alteram sese mihi probare utcunque potuisse.*

PAGE 397.

3. I have here given an English translation of our author's German translation. Whoever wishes to examine the words used by Origen himself, will find them in Wetstein's note to Matth. viii. 28.

PAGE 400.

4. This quotation likewise may be seen in the original, in Wetstein's Note to John i. 28.

PAGE 402.

5. Our author having rejected the critical emendations of his predecessors, proposes here a long catalogue of examples, where he would alter the text of the Greek Testament, without the authority of any manuscript, father, or version. It is true that he displays in them both ingenuity and learning; and as he leaves them to the

the determination of the reader, it would be foreign to the present purpose to call in question the probability of any one example in particular: and for that reason the reader will excuse my having given no extracts from two German works, to which he refers in two or three instances in the course of this section, viz. Michaelis's History of the Resurrection, entitled in German, Auferstehungs-Geschichte, and Michaelis's Mosaic Law, entitled in German, Mosaisches Recht. But as critical conjecture is at best a desperate remedy, and the sources, from which the genuine readings of the Greek Testament may be drawn, are so numerous, the disease must be very grievous, where a medicine of this nature can be justly applied. In a commentary; or an introduction, amendments of this kind may be proposed, but they should never be admitted into the text of the Greek Testament itself. The alterations which have been made by Griesbach are clear and decisive; they are founded on authorities, which are not to be rejected. But as soon as we admit a reading, that is found in no ancient manuscript, in no ancient father, and in no ancient version, we rely merely on the *opinion* of the proposer, who, though possessed of the most profound learning, and endowed with the greatest ingenuity, is not only exposed to the danger of mistaking the meaning of a passage, and of amending therefore where no amendment is necessary, but in the corrections themselves may be guided rather by a lively imagination, than a solid judgement, or, what renders them still more precarious, may be influenced by polemical as well as critical motives, which it is sometimes difficult to distinguish, and with the honest intention of restoring what he supposes the genuine text, recommend such readings as favour his own party. It is true that we cannot apply this objection to our author, who makes an accurate distinction between critical and theological conjecture; but as the line of separation is sometimes difficult to be drawn, and the principle, if once admitted, is subject to the greatest abuse, it is certainly

tainly more safe to reject it, at least from the text itself, in editions of the Greek Testament.

PAGE 405.

6. The person, who signs himself R. in Bowyer's critical conjectures, is Markland. In the third edition the name is written at full length. Valkenaer likewise wrote some critical conjectures on the N. T. They are printed at the end of Hemsterhusii Orationes. Lugduni Bat. 1784, 8vo.

PAGE 408.

7. In the reference to 3 Maccab. iii. 22. is an erratum which I have not been able to correct.

PAGE 417.

8. See on this subject Simon Hist. crit. du texte du N. T. ch. xxix.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the Authors, who have collected Various Readings to the Greek Testament.

PAGE 420.

1. Our author means the first edition. In the second edition of the Apparatus criticus it is p. 74.

PAGE 423.

2. Another edition of this work was published at Cambridge in 1642, folio, under the following title, Joachimi Camerarii commentarius in Novum Fœdus elaboratus, nunc denuo plurimum illustratus et locupletatus.

PAGE 425.

3. See Mill's Prolegomena, § 1505,

PAGE 429.

4. To the names mentioned by our author, may be added those of Cesar de Miffy, Jackson, Woide, Alter, and Birch. See also the account given by Le Long, of those critics, who have engaged in collecting various readings to the New Testament, in his *Bibliotheca sacra*, Tom. I. p. 466—468. ed. Paris. 1723: the chapter in Wetstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 170—181. de variarum lectionum collectoribus atque editoribus: Simon *Histoire critique du texte du N. T.* ch. xxix: Pfaff de genuinis N. T. lectionibus, cap. vi, and Gerardi de Mastricht *Prolegomena*, p. 1—29.

CHAPTER XII.

Of the editions of the Greek Testament.

SECT. I.

PAGE 430.

1. The German title of this work is, *Nachricht von einer Hallischen Bibliothek*. It was a periodical publication of Dr. Baumgarten, and printed between the years 1748 and 1751, in eight volumes 8vo. Mill and Wetstein, in their *Prolegomena*, and Griesbach in the preface to the second volume of his *Greek Testament*, have described the principal editions of the *Greek Testament*: also Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, Vol. IV. p. 185—191. Bengel in his *Apparatus criticus*, p. 69—86. ed. 2da. Walch in his *Bibliotheca Theologica*, Tom. IV. p. 14—32. A very complete account, not only of the principal or critical, but of the editions of the *Greek Testament* in general, is given by Dr. Masch, in his improved edition of *Le Long Bibliotheca sacra*, P. I. p. 189—328. Those who have not this edition, may consult the Paris edition of *Le Long Bibliotheca sacra*, Tom. I. p. 199—226.

PAGE

PAGE 431.

2. It is generally supposed, that before the Complutensian edition of the Greek Testament, which was finished in 1514, unless the date is false, no part of the Greek Testament had ever been printed. But the six first chapters of the Gospel of St. John were printed at Venice, by Aldus Manutius, in 1504, as appears from the subscription, Venetiis ex Aldi Academia, mense Junio MDIIII. A copy of this hitherto unknown edition is preserved in the library of the Duke of Würtemberg, at Stuttgard, and is described by Adler in the Repertorium, Vol. XVIII. p. 150. The whole of St. John's Gospel was published at Tübingen in 1514. See Le Long. Bibl. sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. Vol. III. p. 624.

COMPLUTENSIAN EDITION.

PAGE 431.

3. The Complutensian Polyglot is best described in Le Long Bibliotheca sacra, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 332—339. where the authors are enumerated who have written on this celebrated edition.

PAGE 431.

4. For the German titles of these publications, see Note 15. to this section.

PAGE 433.

5. The account given in the preface to the Complutensian edition of the Greek Testament, in regard to the Greek MSS. which were sent from the Pope's library, is hardly reconcileable with the subscription at the end of the Revelation. In the former no mention is made even of the Codex Rhodiensis, or of any other MSS. than those sent from the Pope's library, α δη και αυτα ο αγιω-
τατος εν χριστω πατηρ, και κυριος ημων, ο μεγαρισος αρχιερευς Λεων
δεκατος, τη ορμη ταυτη συλλαμβανειν προθυμεμενος, εκ της
αποστολικης βιβλιοθηκης αγομενα επεμψε, κ.τ.λ. Now Leo X.
was

was elected Pope March 11, 1513, and yet the subscription at the end of the Revelation bears date Jan. 10, 1514. If therefore the manuscripts were sent by Leo X. they must have arrived when at least three parts of the Greek Testament were already printed, and yet the editors, in the preface at least, mention no other manuscripts. One mode of solving the difficulty is, to suppose that manuscripts were sent from Rome by Julius II. the predecessor of Leo X. and that the writer of the preface to the Complutensian Greek Testament, who knew that the latter was at that time Pope, but perhaps was ignorant how long he had reigned, committed an anachronism in ascribing to Leo X. what had been done by Julius II. Or perhaps he knew that they were sent by Julius II. but meant to flatter the vanity of the reigning Pope, by attributing to him an act of his predecessor. Or Leo X. before he was Pope, might have been instrumental in procuring them from the Vatican, and be therefore entitled to the compliment. Or perhaps the date 1514 is a false one, as the Complutensian edition was not delivered to the public, before 1522. The question still remains to be answered, whether they had other manuscripts of the Greek Testament, beside those, which were sent from Rome. The silence of the editors is no proof of the contrary, for they make no mention of the Codex Rhodienfis, though Stunica, in his controversy with Erasmus, frequently applies to it, as a manuscript used in the Complutensian edition. Cardinal Ximenes, in the preface to the first volume, (it is true that what he there says relates chiefly to the Old Testament) says, ‘ quorum quidem tam Hebræorum, quam Græcorum ac Latinorum multiplicem copiam variis ex locis non sine summo labore conquæsimus.’ But he adds, ‘ Ex ipsis quidem Græca Sanctitati tuæ debemus, qui ex ipsa apostolica bibliotheca antiquissimos tum Veteris, tum Novi Testamenti perquam humane ad nos misisti, qui nobis in hoc negotio maximo fuerunt adjumento.’ Now, as every body would understand from this sentence that Ximenes was indebted for *all* his Greek manu-

manuscripts to Leo X. he has either expressed himself in too general terms, in order to compliment the Pope, or Stunica has appealed to a manuscript, that was never used, and which no author but himself appears to have ever seen. With respect to the Codex Ravianus, see Note 243. to ch. viii. sect. 6.

PAGE 434.

6. Griesbach is of the same opinion. See his preface to the second volume of his Greek Testament, p. 16.

7. Our author is not quite accurate in saying, that the types of the Complutensian edition resemble the letters of the most modern manuscripts: for of all the specimens of Greek hand-writing, which Montfaucon has given in his *Palæographia Græca*, from the first introduction of the small letters, down to the fifteenth century, none resembles the types of the Complutensian edition more than that which is found in manuscripts of the ninth century. See Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 271. On the other hand, letters not very unlike the Complutensian are found in manuscripts of the eleventh, twelfth, and even thirteenth century. See the *Palæographia*, p. 291. 293. 308. 324.

8. It is generally said that the Complutensian Greek Testament is printed without any accents, and the same is asserted even in the preface to the work itself: ‘*Nudæ tantum literæ sine ullis aut spirituum aut tonorum notis impressæ:*’ and again, ‘*visum est priscam in eo linguæ illius vetustatem majestatemque intactam retinere, ac opus ipsum prætermisiss etiam ipsis quibusvis minimis appendiculis excusum ad imaginem antiquarum scripturarum publicare.*’ Yet whoever examines the Complutensian Greek Testament, will find that the words are really accented: of which the editors in the same preface give the following account, ‘*Cæterum ne alicui dubium aliquod possit occurrere, in qua videlicet syllaba accentum oporteat collocari, simplex tantum apex in polysyllabis dictionibus adjectus est; et is quidem non tanquam Græcus accentus, sed tanquam notula signumque*

quo

quo dirigi possit lector, ne in prolatione, modulationeve dictionum aliquando labatur.' Now this simplex apex is precisely the Greek acute accent, and it is constantly placed upon that syllable, to which the acute accent, according to the common rules of accentuation, belongs, for instance, on the antepenultimate of ἀνθρῶπος, and ἀνθρῶποι, on the penultimate of ἀνθρώπῃς, ἀνθρώπων, &c. The place of the tone therefore is as distinctly marked in the Complutensian, as in any other edition; and it is surely a contradiction to say, that it is printed sine ullis tonorum notis, and yet to acknowledge that a simplex apex (which is the acute accent itself) is placed over the syllable to which the tone belongs. Further, it is said in the preface, that this apex being designed as a guide to learners, is placed only over polysyllables; yet whoever examines the work itself will find, that it is placed over every dissyllable without exception. At the same time it must be acknowledged, that the Complutensian Greek Testament so far differs from the common editions, that no separate mark is used for the circumflex or the grave accent: the place of the circumflex being supplied by the acute accent, which is also printed over the last syllable of words, where the grave accent is printed in the common editions.

9. Accents afford no proof that a manuscript is modern; for they are found in several very ancient manuscripts written even with uncial letters; for instance, the Vaticanus, Claromontanus, Sangermanensis, Regius 2861. Codex Wolfii, &c. Perhaps there are as many ancient manuscripts in uncial letters, which have accents, as those, which have not. See Note 29. to ch. xiii.

10. See Note 347. to chap. viii. sect. 6. where the question is clearly decided in the negative.

PAGE 435.

11. If the editors of the Complutensian Greek Testament had used this mark in those cases only, where the Greek text differs from the Latin, as our author supposes, this argument might be admitted in favour of the
assertion

assertion, that the Greek text of this edition has not been altered from the Latin. But I have found numberless examples where this mark is used, though there is no difference whatsoever between the Greek and Latin texts. For instance 1 John v. 7. Quoniam tres sunt ∞∞∞ ∞∞∞ qui testimonium dant, though here is no omission, the Greek being οτι τρεις ειναι οι μαρτυροντες. It was therefore by no means the intention of the Complutensian editors to point out by this mark the difference between the Greek and the Latin texts; and they had evidently no other object in view, in the insertion of this mark, than to dilate the Latin text, as often as it occupied less space than the Greek, and vice versa, in order that both columns might correspond line for line.

12. That the Greek Text 1 John v. 7. in the Complutensian edition is a mere translation of one of the editors, is probable, because the passage is found in not a single ancient, and in only two modern manuscripts, the Montfortianus and the Ravianus, the latter of which is only a copy of this edition; and in the former the text is very different from that in the Complutensian edition. It cannot therefore, as in the third edition of Erasmus, have been taken from this manuscript: though on the other hand, it is not impossible that they found it in some modern MS. in which the passage, as in the Cod. Montfortianus, had been already translated. The question can never be decided, because the MSS. which they used are either destroyed, or are at least unknown. It is however of no importance, whether the passage was translated by a Complutensian editor, or by a transcriber of the fifteenth century. That the Latin Vulgate, as printed in the Complutum edition, had peculiar influence on the Greek, in the whole of this passage, is not to be denied, for the clause και οι τρεις εις το εν εισι, immediately preceding εις την μαρτυριαν, which is omitted in not a single ancient Greek manuscript, nor in our printed editions, though in some few manuscripts of the Vulgate, is rejected from the Complutum edition, for no other reason than because it is there wanting in the Latin

Latin text: so that this clause, which in the common editions occurs twice, occurs there only once, and that exactly in the place, where it does not occur in the Greek manuscripts. The circumstance likewise proves, that the Complutensian editors made use of modern manuscripts of the Vulgate, for this final clause of the eighth verse is found in all the copies of the Vulgate, which were written before the Lateran council held in the year 1215.

PAGE 436.

13. This very modern manuscript, which Erasmus calls Britannicus, is no other than the Codex Montfortianus, as appears from Note 220. to ch. viii. sect. 6.

14. The proper question to be asked seems to be the following, 'Did not the Complutensian editors, in consequence of a too high opinion of the Vulgate, and a mistaken zeal for the Christian religion, introduce sometimes into the Greek text readings of the Vulgate, which they did not find in the Greek manuscripts?'

PAGE 438.

15. But Griesbach makes a proper distinction between the Greek reading *αυτη*, which can refer only to 'Christi,' and the Latin reading 'ejus,' which may refer either to Christ, or to Mary.

16. But it is the reading of the Arabic version published by Erpenius.

PAGE 439.

17. As the controversy between Semler and Goeze, relative to the Complutensian Bible, was conducted in German, it might be expected that a short abstract should be given of it in these notes; but as this would take up too much room, I will quote only the titles of the principal publications, for the sake of those who are acquainted with German, and who may wish to examine the subject more minutely.

Semler's

Semler's *historische und kritische Sammlungen über die so genannten Beweis-Stellen in der Dogmatik*, Vol. I. Halle 1764, 8vo.

Goezen's *Vertheidigung der Complutensischen Bibel insonderheit des Neuen Testaments gegen die Wettsteinischen und Semlerschen Beschuldigungen*, Hamburg 1765, 8vo.

Semler's *genauere Untersuchung der schlechten Beschaffenheit des zu Alcala gedruckten Neuen Testaments*, Halle 1766, 8vo.

Goezen's *ausführlichere Vertheidigung des Complutensischen Neuen Testaments*, Hamburg 1766, 8vo.

Semler's *historische und kritische Sammlungen über die so genannten Beweis-Stellen in der Dogmatik*, Vol. II. Halle 1768.

Goezens *Fortsetzung der ausführlicheren Vertheidigung des Complutensischen Griechischen N. T. nebst einer Sammlung der vornehmsten Verschiedenheiten des Grundtextes und der Vulgata derselben*, Hamburg 1769, 8vo.

It was the principal object of Goeze to support the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. and as this passage is in the Complutensian Bible, he defended the antiquity and value of the Greek manuscripts, from which he supposed that passage had been taken, and not translated from the Latin. Semler's object was to shew the spuriousness of this passage, and at the same time to support the opinion of Wettstein, that the text of the Complutensian Greek Testament in general is of little value. Now in this controversy two questions have been united, which ought to be separated. 1. Whether 1 John v. 7. be genuine. 2. Whether the manuscripts used by the Complutensian editors were ancient and valuable: for the one might be denied, though the other were affirmed, since editors who used the best manuscripts might interpolate a spurious passage. The former question is at present clearly decided in the negative. In regard to the latter, I am too little acquainted with the Complutensian Bible to be able to form any judgement; it is sufficient therefore

fore to add, that Griesbach accedes to the opinion of Wetstein and Semler, and says, in the preface to the second volume of his Greek Testament, p. 16. Complutenses non habuerunt codices Græcos, nisi paucos, recentes, exigui fere, si ad lectionum bonitatem spectes, pretii.

Thus far I had written in the first edition of these notes: but since that time I have accurately collated the Complutensian text, and have seen with my own eyes, that Griesbach's opinion is well founded. I have examined the Complutensian edition throughout whole books, and have found that the readings of ancient manuscripts, which are not at the same time contained in modern manuscripts, are not contained in the Complutensian edition. There is no reason therefore to suppose, that the editors used ancient MSS. since they inserted no readings, but such as are found in modern MSS. And the very numerous differences between the Complutensian text, and that of ancient MSS. especially of the celebrated Codex Vaticanus (see above, Chap. VIII. note 347) prove that the editors either were not in possession of ancient manuscripts, or, what is the same thing in our present inquiry, did not form the Complutensian text from them. With respect to the charge brought against the Complutensian editors, that they modelled their Greek text according to the Vulgate, I have found, that *in general* it is not true. For though in some few *single* passages, as Matth. x. 25. 1 John v. 7. they follow the Vulgate in opposition to all the Greek manuscripts, there are more than two hundred passages in the Catholic Epistles, in which the Complutensian Greek text differs from the text of the Vulgate as printed in the Complutensian edition.

PAGE 440.

18. The reading of the Complutensian edition is not εις Βηθλεεμ, but εως εις Βηθλεεμ. The editions copied from that of Complutum, to which our author alludes, are the Plantin, and the Geneva editions.

PAGE

PAGE 441.

19. This very circumstance may console us for their loss, for, as rockets are not made of vellum, it is a certain proof that the MSS. were written on paper, and therefore of no great antiquity. It is true that our author calls them vellum MSS. on account of the words ‘*como membranas inutiles*,’ quoted in his note. But the word ‘*como*’ makes this expression too indeterminate, to lead to any certain conclusion.

PAGE 442.

20. Our author gives here some examples from the book of Revelation, in which the Codex Guelpherbytanus C. agrees with the Complutenian edition. For instance, ch. v. 8. they both omit *οι* before *εικοσιτεσσαρες*, ch. vii. 15. have *τω θρονω* for *τς θρονς*, ver. 16. *ετι, &δ' & μη* for *ετι, &δε μη*. He has given several other examples, but on comparing these with the list of readings in Knittel's own publication, I have found them to be errata, which I have not taken the pains to correct, as they seem to be of no importance.

21. The mark, to which our author alludes, was not intended to point out the difference between the Greek and Latin texts. See above, Note 11.

PAGE 443.

22. From the Greek text of the Complutenian edition were printed the following, viz. seven at Antwerp by Plantin in 1564, 1573, 1574, 1590, 1591, 1601, 1612: five Geneva editions in 1609, 1619, 1620, 1628, 1632: and lastly that of Mayntz in 1753. These are described in Le Long *Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 191—195.

EDITIONS BY ERASMUS.

23. The origin and progress of the editions by Erasmus is related at full length in Wettstein's *Prolegomena*,
VOL. II. H h h p. 120

p. 120—141. and in *Le Long. Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 281—292.

24. See *Maittaire Annales Typographici*, Tom. II. Pars prior, p. 2. Note c.

25. The first edition of Erasmus, which was finished in 1516, was not only not begun in 1513, but not even proposed to Erasmus before April 17th, 1515: for Rhenanus, in a letter addressed to him from Basel with this date, writes, *Petit Frobenius abs te Novum Testamentum, pro quo tantum se daturum pollicetur, quantum alius quisquam. Ib. Not. b.* And Erasmus himself says of his first edition, *Præcipitatum fuit verius quam editum.* The subscription to this first edition is *Basilicæ, in ædibus Johannis Frobenii Hammelburgenfis, Mense Februario, Anno M.D. xvi.* But, what is extraordinary, and seems hardly to agree with the date of Rhenanus's letter, the preface to the annotations annexed to this first edition is dated, *Basilicæ, M.D. xv.*

PAGE 444.

26. The article is not omitted before *αλλος*, in almost all our editions of the Greek Testament; Wetstein at least quotes only those of Colinæus and Bengel. The omission, which may rather be ascribed to the hurry of Erasmus than to actual design, was corrected by Robert Stephens; see his third edition, p. 198; and the article is really found before *αλλος*, not only in that of Stephens, but in all the common editions.

27. This edition has two dates, for the subscription at the bottom of p. 565. is *M.D. xviii.* but the two following pages are dated *M.D. xix.*

PAGE 445.

28. The manuscripts which Erasmus used, are those noted by Wetstein in the first part 1. 2. 3. 61. 69. (*Proleg.* p. 120.) 4. 7. in the second part, and 1. in the fourth part.

PAGE 446.

29. It is probably a mistake that two editions of the Greek Testament were printed at Strasburg in the same year 1524. Maittaire, in his *Annales Typographici*, T. II. Pars posterior, p. 644. describes *Novum Testamentum Græce cura Fabricii Capitonis editum apud Wolfium Cephalæum*, 8vo. Argentorati 1524: but makes no mention of any other edition of the Greek Testament at Strasburg in the same year. Our author seems to have confounded 1524 with 1534, in which last year another Strasburgh edition of the Greek Testament appeared, but this was not modelled after the edition of Aldus. See *Le Long Bibl. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 198.

30. This edition, which has a preface by Oecolampadius, was re-printed in 1535, with the subscription, *Basileæ apud Jo. Bebelium*, mense Febuario, AN. M. D. XXXV.

PAGE 447.

31. Dr. Harwood has likewise a very high opinion of this edition, for in his view of the various editions of the classics, p. 118. he says, 'I have found this edition of the Greek Testament by Colinaeus by far the best and most correct.'

32. The full title of this edition is given in *Le Long Bibliotheca sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 302. It there appears, that though Wettstein has ascribed to it the title *editio Bogardi*, and our author describes Bogard as the publisher, that Bogard has no concern in the publication. Some of the copies were sold in his shop, and these have on the title 'veneunt apud Jacobum Bogardum,' while the other copies have 'veneunt apud Johannem Neigny.'

33. Three editions of the Greek Testament were published by Plater at Basel, the first in 1538, the second in 1540, the third in 1543. See a description of them in *Le Long Bib. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. 200. Now the title of the third corresponds to that which is here given by our author and dated by him 1544. His date therefore is probably a mistake, and ought to be 1543.

It is true that Maittaire in his *Annales Typographici*, Tom. III. Pars prior, p. 357. mentions a fourth edition by Plater in 1544, but he acknowledges that he had never seen it, and that he relies on the authority of Le Long. Now Dr. Masch in the place above quoted says, *Addit Le Long editionem iteratam anno 1544, de qua vero omnino dubito.*

34. *Εν τῇ καθεξῆς* for *ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς* is found in no MS. and in no other edition: and as it not only alters the sense as our author, but even destroys it, it is undoubtedly an error of the press.

PAGE 488.

35. Our author mentions only seven editions taken from the text of Erasmus, but they amount to upwards of twenty. See Le Long *Bib. sacra. ed. Masch, P. I. p. 196—205.*

EDITIONS BY R. STEPHENS.

36. *Prima Stephani editio Complutensem sequitur pressius, quidque ipse probarit magis indicat: secunda item, sed admixtis erratis pluribus: in tertia, Erasmini editioni quintæ vix uspiam mutatæ marginem varietate editionis Complutensis et MSS. suorum distinctum opponit.*

See Griesbach's Pref. to the 2d. Vol. of his *Greek Testament*, p. 24—26.

37. Wettstein, in his *Prolegomena*, p. 143, 144. has clearly shewn, that H. Stephens was the person who collated the manuscripts for the editions published by his father R. Stephens. Now it is generally supposed, and it is likewise asserted by our author, in treating of the *Codices Stephanici*, that all the sixteen manuscripts (including the Complutensian edition) which are quoted in R. Stephens's edition of 1550, had been collated previous to the first edition of 1546. But we must except at least the *Codex β*, which could not have been collated till after the year 1547, because this manuscript was
collated

collated in Italy, and H. Stephens did not go into Italy before that year. See Maittaire *Historia Stephanorum*, p. 204—207. Nor does R. Stephens say a syllable about any manuscript collated in Italy, in the preface to his two first editions, though he particularly mentions the manuscripts borrowed from the royal library. It is true, that in the preface to the edition of 1550 he pretends to have regulated the text of his two first editions, by the extracts from all the manuscripts which he quotes in the third: but this was probably done with no other view, than to enhance the value, and promote the sale of his former publications.

38. That is, Robert Stephens has noted in the margin of his edition five hundred and ninety-eight readings of the Complutensian text, which differ from his own. But Mill, on collating the two editions, found that they differed in above seven hundred instances, in addition to those which Stephens had marked, so that the whole number amounts to at least thirteen hundred. See Mill's *Prolegomena*, § 1226.

39. See Mill's *Prolegomena*, § 1220. In this same year another edition was printed at Paris, precisely of the same size, and with types so nearly resembling those of the two first editions of R. Stephens, that without due attention the one might be mistaken for the other. The title is *Της καινης διαθηκης απαντα*. *Novum Testamentum*. Parisiis, impensis viduæ Arnoldi Birkmanni, 1549. 16mo. At the end is, *Excudebat Lutetiæ Parisiorum Benedictus Prævotius, typographus, in vico Frementello, ad clausum Brunellum, sub insigni stellæ aureæ, anno M.D.XLIX. Idibus Martiis*. But it consists of two volumes; and there are no Greek letters in the margin expressive of the ancient Greek chapters, as in the editions by R. Stephens. It seems to be nothing more than a re-impression of R. Stephens's first edition. Le Long, in his *Bib. sacra*, P. I. p. 215. ed. Masch, mentions another edition of the same size, and printed at Paris in the same year, with the very same subscription; but instead of Birkmann, the name of Haultin is on the

title page. I have never seen it: but it is probably the same edition, with a different title-page.

40. The three first and fifth of the editions of Robert Stephens were published at Paris, the fourth at Geneva. The two first are in 12mo. and have no various readings: the third which is in folio is one of the most elegant editions that were ever printed, and has the readings of Stephens's manuscripts in the margin. In the fifth, various readings are printed at the end. They are described in *Le Long Bib. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 208—214. 305—307. The editions which were printed from those of Robert Stephens are described *ib.* p. 215—222.

EDITIONS BY BEZA.

PAGE 449.

41. I have given a literal translation of this sentence, but I do not exactly comprehend its meaning. The words seem to import, that Beza procured Stephens's edition of 1550, in which various readings had been written in the margin, in addition to those which are printed in that edition. In writing this sentence our author had probably in view the following passage in Mill's *Prolegomena*, § 1258. Paulo post evulgatam a Rob. Stephano N. T. editionem illam nobilissimam anno 1550, Henricus ejus filius, notatis ad oram istius editionis lectionibus variantibus Ed. Complutensis, et quindecim MSS. exemplarium, adjecerat variationes aliorum decem codicum, et editionum pene omnium quæ Stephanicam præcefferant. Hoc exemplar Robertus Theodoro Bezae suo in manus tradidit. But for this assertion Mill had no historical evidence, and the whole relation has no other ground than the following passage in Beza's preface to his edition of the Greek Testament (sign. IIII, ed. 1582). Ad hæc omnia accessit exemplar ex Stephani nostri bibliotheca cum *viginti quinque* plus minus manuscriptis codicibus, et omnibus pene impressis ab Henrico Stephano ejus filio et paternæ sedulitatis hærede, quam diligentissime collatum. Now as only fifteen ma-
nuscripts

manuscripts are quoted in R. Stephens's edition of 1550, and Beza uses the expression *viginti quinque*, Mill concluded that H. Stephens collated ten other manuscripts *after* the publication of the edition of 1550, that the readings of the ten additional manuscripts were added to those of the other fifteen, and that the edition of 1550, thus enriched with written marginal readings, was presented to Theodore Beza. But as Henry Stephens himself has never given the least hint of this second collation of manuscripts, Wetstein (Prol. p. 145.) contends that the words '*viginti quinque plus minus*' are hyperbolical, and that proper allowance must be made for Beza's lax mode of expression: '*verba hyperbolica Bezae esse commoda interpretatione mollienda.*' A more ingenious solution is that, which ascribes the inaccuracy not to Beza himself, but to the printer: namely, it has been supposed that Beza wrote *xv codicibus*, the number of manuscripts actually quoted in Stephens's margin, that *xv* was mistaken for *xxv*, and that hence arose the expression '*viginti quinque*' in Beza's preface. Now all these explanations of Mill, Wetstein, &c. rest on the supposition that by the words '*Exemplar ex Stephani nostri bibliotheca,*' Beza understood R. Stephens's edition of 1550. But if this had been Beza's meaning, he would rather have said *Editio Stephanica an. 1550*, or *editio Stephani tertia*, and would hardly have used the indeterminate expression *Exemplar*, without any thing to fix its meaning. Besides, if he had meant the printed edition of 1550, and the words *viginti quinque* are to be understood, not literally with Mill, but hyperbolically with Wetstein, why was it necessary for him to have recourse to the library of R. Stephens in particular, when he might have procured it from every bookseller in Europe. By the word '*exemplar*' therefore I would rather understand some printed edition of the Greek Testament, prior to any of those of R. Stephens, in which H. Stephens had noted, either in the margin, or on blank leaves, if the book was interleaved, the readings of those manuscripts, which he had collated for his father's editions. We know

for certain that, whatever was the mode adopted by H. Stephens in forming his collection of various readings, the collection itself, as written by H. Stephens, came into the hands of Beza. See Wetstein's Prol. p. 145. We know likewise, that though only fifteen manuscripts are quoted in Stephens's margin, a much greater number were examined by Henry Stephens, if not collated: for he says in his preface to the edition of 1587 (see Wetstein's Prol. p. 143) *Plusquam triginta veteres scripturæ libros vidi, partim in regis Galliæ bibliotheca, (quorum auctoritatem et fidem pater meus in illa editione grandi secutus est) partim in Italicis.* All these circumstances are in favour of the above-mentioned hypothesis, that Beza understood by the word 'exemplar' Henry Stephens's autograph. For as Beza knew that H. Stephens had *seen* upwards of *thirty* manuscripts, but that only *fifteen* were actually *quoted* in the edition of 1550, he might easily take some indeterminate medium, and use the expression *Exemplar cum viginti quinque plus minus MSis-codicibus collatum*, as he probably did not know the precise number that was actually collated. And as the subject related not to the printed text, but only to the marginal readings written by Henry Stephens, we see the reason why Beza used the general term *Exemplar*, without thinking it necessary to specify the particular edition.

42. Our author is perfectly accurate in describing the edition of 1565, as the first edition, which Beza published of the Greek Testament. For though Beza's Latin translation, which first appeared in 1556, was reprinted in 1559, accompanied with the Greek text, yet as that Greek text was nothing more than a re-impression of R. Stephens's fourth edition, it does not belong to the series of editions published by Beza. See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 146. and Le Long Bib. sacra, ed. Masch, Tom. I. p. 308.

43. In the dedication 'Christiano lectori,' which Beza has prefixed to his edition of 1582, he says, *Non modo cum*

cum variis *septendecim* Græcorum codicum a Roberto Stephano citatorum lectionibus, &c. In the edition of 1598, he says, Annus agitur quadragesimus secundas, Christiane lector, ex quo N. T. Latinam interpretationem emendare sum aggressus, Græco contextu non modo cum *novendecim* vetustissimis manuscriptis, &c. Now these two accounts do not contradict each other, because in the word *novendecim* in the last edition, Beza meant to include his own two manuscripts. But it is difficult to explain Beza's mistake, in saying that seventeen manuscripts are quoted in the margin of R. Stephens's edition of 1550, when R. Stephens himself expressly declares in the preface to that edition that he quotes only sixteen, including the Complutensian: and though there are many errata in Stephens's margin, the number 16 or 17 has never been discovered in it. Perhaps however the mistake was occasioned in the following manner. We sometimes say that the number of manuscripts quoted by Stephens amounted to sixteen, at other times we say that they amounted only to fifteen, according as we include the Complutensian edition, or not. Beza therefore in writing his dedication might have a general recollection of sixteen manuscripts, and forget that the Complutensian was included in that computation: in which case, as he knew that it was actually quoted, he might add it to the sixteen, and thus describe Stephens's manuscripts as being one more, than they really were.

Another charge of still greater inaccuracy is laid to Beza by Wettstein, Prol. p. 148. Fœdissimum illud est quod circa varias lectiones a R. Stephano A° 1550 editas commisit: cum enim ex præfatione Stephani sciret xv tantum MStos Codices ab eo consultos et cum editis collatos fuisse, non veritus est eorum numerum augere, de viginti quinque plus minus manuscriptis Stephani codicibus in præfatione locutus. But this charge rests on the supposition that the word 'Exemplar' in Beza's preface signifies R. Stephens's edition of 1550, which is improbable, as appears from Note 41.

PAGE 449.

44. Our author has neglected to mention the edition of 1598, which was the last edition published by Beza himself. It is described, as well as the four preceding editions of 1565, 1576, 1582, and 1589, in *Le Long Bib. sacra*, ed. Masch, Tom. I. p. 309—313.

45. *Apparatus criticus*, p. 72. 2da.

46. The Elzevir editions follow the text of Stephens much more closely than that of Beza. See *Le Long Bib. sacra*, ed. Masch, P. I. p. 226. The first Elzevir edition, which was printed in 1624, deserves particularly to be noticed, because the text of the Greek Testament, which had fluctuated in the preceding editions, acquired in this a consistency, and seemed during upwards of a century to be exposed to no future alterations. The text of this edition is found in almost all, that have been printed since that period, and to this text Wettstein himself adapted his various readings. See his *Prolegomena*, p. 151. It has acquired therefore the title of *Editio recepta*, and the expression *textus ab omnibus receptus*, of which the editors boast in their preface, has been really prophetic. But that it deserves not the title of *textus perfectus*, is evident from the critical edition of Griesbach.

47. *Jo. Boissii Veteris interpretis cum Beza aliisque recentioribus collatio in quatuor evangeliiis et apostolorum actis*. Londini 1655, 8vo.

PAGE 450.

48. Mill, in his *Prolegomena*, § 1298. relates that this edition was taken from that of Robert Stephens the younger, printed at Paris in 1569.

PAGE 451.

49. This work of Rumpæus, which is in very low estimation, I have never read, and therefore cannot tell whether he has accused Curcellæus justly or unjustly.

50. The

50. The Paris Polyglot does not consist of nine volumes, as our author says, but of ten: and the Greek, Syriac, Arabic, and Latin texts of the New Testament are not contained in the fifth volume, but in the ninth and tenth volumes.

PAGE 453.

51. It is not absolutely certain that Fell was here guilty of an oversight. See Note 326 to ch. vii. sect. 6.

PAGE 454.

52. Both printed at Leipzig, the one in 1697, the other in 1702.

PAGE 456.

53. That Mill adhered strictly to the truth, or, in other words, that he never misrepresented any subject of criticism by design, is an assertion which no one will deny; but, as we have equal reason to believe the same of Wetstein, our author very unjustly pays a compliment to the former, at the expence of the latter. The praises, which our author has bestowed on the diligence of Mill, are perfectly just; but at the same time, whoever is acquainted with the literary life of Wetstein must acknowledge, that Wetstein's unremitted labour was hardly ever exceeded in any age, or in any country.

PAGE 462.

54. This edition was republished at Leipzig in 1723; at least many of the copies of Küster's edition, have on the title page, *Editio Secunda, Lipsiæ, sumptibus Filii J. F. Gleditschii 1723.* But Dr. Masch, in his edition of *Le Long Bibliotheca sacra*, P. I. p. 239. says, *Editio iterata, uti libri titulus vult: sed sunt qui non sine veri specie affirmant antiquiorem editionem novo ornatam esse titulo.*

PAGE 464.

55. Critical examination of the late new text and version of the Greek Testament by Leonard Twells. London 1732, 8vo.

PAGE

PAGE 466.

57. Bengel himself says, *Ne syllabam quidem, etiam si mille MSti, mille critici juberent, antehac non receptam adducar ut recipiam.* This is the greatest deference, as Mr. Bowyer observes, that ever was paid to the prefs.

PAGE 468.

58. This charge is really ungrounded, for Wetstein leaves us by no means in a state of uncertainty, whether the common reading be supported by no manuscript, or by an hundred. It is true that he quotes in general only those manuscripts, which have the reading that differs from his printed text, but as we know not only how many manuscripts he used in each part of the Greek Testament, which alone would be insufficient, but likewise, partly from his own *Prolegomena*, partly from those of Mill, what manuscripts have been collated throughout, and what have only been consulted for particular passages, what manuscripts are complete, and what are defective, we are enabled to form a tolerable judgement in regard to the proportion of evidence in favour of the common text, to that which is against it. Nor is the omission to be censured as a fault; for had Wetstein quoted on all occasions the evidence in favour of the common reading, as well as that against it, he would have swelled his work to at least four folio volumes. But if it is really a fault, Bengel in his *Apparatus criticus* is guilty of the very same; for instead of quoting in all cases the evidence on both sides of the question, as our author's words at least imply, he quotes in general only in favour of those readings, which he either preferred or thought worthy of notice; and when he does quote manuscripts on the other side of the question, it is in general no direct and positive testimony, but only a mere inference. For instance, if seven manuscripts had been examined by Mill in a particular passage for a certain reading, and that reading was quoted only from four, he concluded that it was not in the other three, and put them down as evidence

evidence on the other side. But this conclusion may be made by every man, as easily as by Bengel.

WETSTEIN'S EDITION.

PAGE 471.

59. This paragraph is followed in the German original by a long description of the controversy between Wetstein and the clergy of Basel; which I have taken the liberty to omit, not only because it seems foreign to the present subject, but because every reader may find it at full length at the end of Wetstein's Prolegomena.

PAGE 472.

60. On the religious controversy which was conducted between Wetstein and the clergy in Basel, I make no remark, because it seems wholly superfluous in reading a work, which is philological and critical, to enquire whether the author was a member of the church of Rome, a follower of Luther, or a disciple of Calvin. But, when Wetstein's honesty as a critic is called in question, it is necessary to defend him. Our author accuses him of being guilty of a *finesse*, that is inconsistent with honour and integrity. But in what does this *finesse* consist? In explaining the words *ἐξ ὧν ὁ χρίστος το κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὡν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητός εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας*, Rom. ix. 5. in that part of the page, which is allotted to the various readings. Now this accusation implies not only want of candour, but want of attention to Wetstein's general plan. For though the inquiry here relates not to a variation in the words, it relates to a variation in the stops; it belongs therefore properly to that part of the page in which the varieties in the text itself are examined. It is true, that no ancient manuscripts can be quoted on this subject, but if this is an argument in favour of the accusation, all readings that are quoted from critical conjecture should be referred to the notes at the bottom of the page, which our author himself would surely disapprove. But even if we admitted that the note were improperly placed, the
only

only inference would be that Wettstein had been guilty of an error in judgment, not of a breach of honesty : for if his intention had been to propagate false principles, and place them to the best advantage, he would have gained nothing by the present position, since they would have been more visible among the notes at the bottom of the page, which are printed in larger letters than those among the various readings, and are alone consulted by at least three fourths of those, who make use of his edition.

PAGE 474.

61. No man, who is acquainted with Wettstein's Greek Testament, will deny that in the letters, and figures, which denote the collated manuscripts, are numerous errata ; but the source, which according to our author's representation must have been the most productive of error, seems to be imaginary. For it pre-supposes that Wettstein not only made two different classifications of his manuscripts, the one in the first, the other in the second edition, of his Prolegomena, but that he also arranged under the text of his Greek Testament his various readings, first according to the marks assigned to his manuscripts in the first edition of his Prolegomena, and afterwards altered these marks agreeably to the notation, which is used in the second edition, which was prefixed to his Greek Testament. Our author speaks of this alteration as of a real fact ; but there is no historical evidence in favour of the assertion, nor is it agreeable to the rules of probability. That Wettstein had collected his materials, that he was in possession of most of his extracts from the manuscripts, which he has quoted, at the time when he published his first edition of the Prolegomena in 1730, may be readily admitted ; but that they were arranged under the text, in the order in which they appeared twenty years afterwards, and that Wettstein employed this long interval merely in transforming the marks from one notation to the other, which necessarily follows from the supposition that his various readings were arranged so early as 1730, is highly improbable ; and

and when we take the following circumstance into the account, is wholly incredible. It is well known that according to Wettstein's first arrangement the manuscripts were divided into four principal classes, the last of which was subdivided into three under-classes, and that the notation in each class began with N°. I. Further, this classification had no reference to the contents of the manuscripts as in the second edition, for in the same class are frequently manuscripts of the Gospels, manuscripts of the epistles, &c. It could therefore never have entered into Wettstein's imagination to quote by these numbers, since he would have left his readers wholly in the dark in regard to the manuscripts, which he meant. The case is here totally different from that which we find in his Greek Testament, where, though the same letter or figure in the four different parts frequently denotes four different manuscripts, the notation is subject to no confusion, because the Prolegomena prefixed to each of the four parts sufficiently determine their meaning: whereas the general classification, which Wettstein first adopted merely to point out to his readers the chronology and country of his manuscripts, he could never have intended as a mode of notation in quoting the various readings. It appears therefore that our author's apprehensions are ungrounded, and that the transformation, which he supposes to have been productive of error, has never existed.

PAGE 476.

62. Our author here censures Wettstein very unjustly, and the charge of partiality, which he lays to that eminent critic, recoils upon himself. Polemical divinity must be totally separated from sacred criticism, for a reading is not rendered spurious by its opposition to an established creed, nor genuine by their agreement. The text of the Greek Testament must be determined, before articles can be formed from it, and we argue in a circle, if we condemn a text as spurious because it contradicts a theological system, when that very system depends on the authenticity of the text. The only business of a critic is
 impartially

impartially to weigh the evidence, which may be brought for or against a reading, and to determine on that side, on which the scale preponderates. Now that Wetstein has acted agreeably to this principle in preferring $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$ to $\Theta\epsilon\varsigma$, Acts xx. 28. no man who transgresses not the bounds of truth can deny : for $\Theta\epsilon\varsigma$ is found in not a single ancient manuscript written in uncial letters, whereas $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$ is ratified by the authority of the Codd. Alexandrinus, Ephrem, Cantabrigienfis, and Laudanus 3. See Griesbach's clear and impartial remarks on this passage. For the rejection of $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, 1 Tim. iii. 16. Wetstein has the same proportion of evidence in his favour, since here again this reading is found a prima manu in not a single ancient manuscript in uncial letters, nor in a single ancient version, except the Arabic which is of very little authority. See Griesbach's note to this passage. Wetstein therefore is by no means partial in summing up the evidence for this or that particular reading, not even in passages, which relate to controverted points of speculative theology.

PAGE 478.

63. As Wetstein's Greek Testament is a kind of standard in sacred criticism, it is of importance to determine, whether the negligence, of which our author complains, is founded on fact. I have therefore carefully examined the ten examples which he has here produced as proofs of his assertion ; but what is extraordinary, there is not one among the ten in which our author is not mistaken : this short Note therefore contains not less than ten ungrounded accusations. To set this matter in a clear light, I will specify from our author's *Curæ in Actus Apostolorum Syriacos*, to which he refers, each particular charge, and quote in answer what Wetstein has performed, or neglected.

Acts vii. 29.

Curæ, p. 96. Mill quotes $\kappa\alpha\iota$ for κ from Covel 3. Wetstein omits this quotation, and quotes Barocc. 3.

Answer.

Answer. Wetstein does not quote Barocc. 3. He quotes only Cod. 28. which in the Acts of the Apostles denotes Covell. 5. Now 28. is here an error of the press for 26. which denotes Covell. 3. for whoever compares the quotations of Mill and Wetstein in the Acts of the Apostles, will find that where the one has Covell. 3. the other has 26.

Acts xii. 14.

Curæ, p. 109. Mill quotes Laud. 3. for the insertion of *αὐτῷ* after *ἠνοιξέ*, which Wetstein has neglected.

Answer. Mill does not quote Laud. 3. for the insertion of *αὐτῷ* only, but for *αὐτῷ τὴν θύραν*, instead of *πυλωνα*, and Wetstein quotes the same reading from the same MS.

Acts xiii. 1.

Curæ, p. 110. Note (*). The Cod. Steph. β. is quoted in this verse for *μανηλ*, but Wetstein has not quoted for this reading the Cod. Cant.

Answer. If Wetstein therefore had quoted the Cod. Cant. his quotation would have been wholly unwarranted: and that the Cod. Cant. has not this reading I have found on examining the MS.

Acts xvi. 22.

Curæ, p. 121. Mill quotes the Cod. Cant. and Covell. 3. for *οχλος πολυς*, both of which MSS. are omitted by Wetstein.

Answer. Mill quotes the Cod. Cant. for *πολυς οχλος*, the Covell. 3. for *ο οχλος πολυς*, and Wetstein has the very same readings from the very same MSS.

Acts xvi. 37.

Curæ, p. 122. Mill quotes the Cod. Cant. for *ανατις*, which Wetstein omits.

Answer. Wetstein has actually this reading from the Cod. Cant.

Acts xviii. 8.

Curæ, p. 125. Mill quotes the Cod. Cant. for the addition of *τῷ θεῷ*. Wetstein omits it.

Answer. Mill does not quote the Cod. Cant. for the addition of *τῷ Θεῷ* only, but for the addition of a whole clause, and this very clause is quoted word for word by Wetstein from the same MS.

Acts xix. 18.

Curæ, p. 127. Mill has improperly quoted the Syriac version for *αμαρτίας*, instead of the common reading *πράξεις*, but Wetstein has quoted no various reading.

Answer. If Mill has quoted inaccurately from the Syriac version, Wetstein is rather to be commended for not following his example. But Wetstein has actually quoted the reading *αμαρτίας* from the Cod. Basil. B. X. 20.

Acts xix. 27.

Curæ, p. 129. Mill quotes the Cod. Cant. for the omission of *μεγαλειότητος*, which Wetstein has neglected.

Answer. Mill quotes the Cod. Cant. for the omission of *την μεγαλειότητα αὐτης*, (*μεγαλειότητος* is a mistake of our author, occasioned by Mill's quoting this reading from another MS.) and this very omission is noted by Wetstein.

Acts xxi. 22. (21. is an erratum).

Curæ, p. 139. Mill has quoted from the Editio Complutensis a various reading, *ακροσονται γὰρ*.

Answer. The Ed. Compl. is here quoted neither in Küster's edition, nor in that of Oxford.

Luke xxiv. 18.

Lastly, our author adds in the Note in question, that Wetstein has neglected to quote *εἰς* for *εἰ*: but this charge is as ungrounded as the preceding, for Wetstein not only quotes this reading, but supports it by the authority of three MSS. whereas Mill had quoted no MS. and Küster only two. He also refers for this reading to Mill's Prolegomena, § 1347. which he could not have copied from Küster, by whom this reference is not made.

PAGE 478.

64. Our author seems not aware of a circumstance, which Griesbach relates in the Preface to his Greek Testament, Vol. I. p. 17. that Mill himself, after the sheets of his edition were printed off, made, in the copy which he reserved for himself, many corrections with the pen. This copy is now preserved in the Bodleian, and was used by Wettstein, who profited by Mill's written corrections, and cannot therefore himself be corrected from Mill's printed Notes.

PAGE 479.

65. Our author is here doubly mistaken, for it appears from the end of Note 63. that Wettstein has not omitted *eis*: it also appears from the Apparatus Criticus, p. 213. that Bengel has only quoted the two MSS. which had been alleged by Küster, viz. the Parisin. 5. 8. They cannot therefore be called Bengel's extracts.

66. This is a proof not only of Wettstein's critical judgement, but of his impartiality and integrity.

PAGE 480.

67. Here again our author himself is inaccurate, not Wettstein: for Acts xiv. 13. Mill quotes the Syriac version for the omission of *αυτων*, and this is actually noted by Wettstein. Acts xxiii. 9. it is true that Wettstein deviates from Mill; but Wettstein is accurate, and Mill inaccurate. The common reading is *οι γραμματεις*, as a various reading to which Mill quotes *τινες των γραμματειων*, as expressed in the Syriac version. Wettstein takes no notice of any difference between the cases of the noun substantive in the Greek and the old Syriac, but simply quotes the latter, for *τινες* instead of *οι*. He has therefore corrected the error of his predecessor, for the Syriac text is really ܩܪܕܝܬܐ, 'quidam legisperiti.' But from the Philoxenian version Wettstein has quoted *των γραμματειων*.

68. These two examples, in which Wetstein is not to be defended, are properly corrected by Griesbach.

69. It is rather a matter of surprize that Wetstein has so seldom failed, as he used the MS. only fourteen days. The readings, which he inaccurately quoted from the Philoxenian version, are noted by Storr in the 7th. and 10th. Vols. of the Repertorium.

PAGE 481.

70. This assertion is more than any man can prove: for *αν* is very frequently used as synonymous to *εαν*, and Wetstein has therefore very properly omitted to quote the Vulgate; for its reading *cum* decides neither in favour of *αν*, nor of *εαν*. The fact is simply this, *οπως αν ελθωσι* is usually translated as if *αν* were a potential particle, but the author of the Vulgate has taken it in an hypothetical conjunction.

71. *Και* is used in this manner not only in no classic author, but in no instance in the whole Greek Testament. Our author says this use of it is a Hebraism, but though we sometimes find an hypothetical clause begin with *וְ*, 'si,' and the clause, which contains the inference, with the particle *י*, for instance Gen. xiv. 9. yet this use of the particle *י* in Hebrew is by no means so common, as that of the particle *ف* in Arabic.

72. The reading of the Codex Cantabrigiensis is not *οπως επελθωσιν*, but *οπως αν επελθωσιν*. Whether the reading *επελθωσιν* is a translation of some Latin version, I will not undertake to determine; but it is certainly not a translation of that version which is opposite to the Greek text in the Codex Cantabrigiensis, for that has 'ut veniant tempora.' At all events it is more reasonable to suppose, that Tertullian's reading 'supervenant' is a translation of *επελθωσιν*, than *επελθωσιν* a translation of 'supervenant.'

73. Mill has quoted *ut cum* from the Vulgate, to shew that the Greek conjunction is there used hypothetically, not potentially, and decides neither in favour of *αν*, nor of *εαν*.

74. It

74. It is likewise omitted in the old Latin versions, as they are called, in the Codd. Claromontanus, Sangermanensis, and Boernerianus, as well as in the Arabic of Erpenius. See Griesbach in loco.

PAGE 482.

75. The text of Wechel's edition of 1597 is, *ἐπεκεῖνα Βαβυλωνος*, and *Δαμασκου* is quoted only as a various reading at the bottom of the page, but without any particular manuscript being specified, namely, "pro *Βαβυλωνος*, al. *Δαμασκου*." Mill therefore quotes in this passage not the text of Wechel's edition, but a various reading to the text of that edition, which the editor has given on his bare word, without quoting any authority, or at least without naming any manuscript in particular. Now it is well known, that the various readings in Wechel's edition were chiefly taken from the readings in the margin of Robert Stephens (Mill's Prol. § 1298); but Robert Stephens has *Βαβυλωνος* in the text, and it is accompanied by no various reading whatsoever. The reading therefore *Δαμασκου* is supported by no authority, and Wetstein acted right, in rejecting what Mill had taken upon trust.

76. It is true that Wetstein is here guilty of an oversight, and that he did not observe that *ⲁⲁ* preceded *ⲉ*, which alters the sense. But this very mistake shews that Wetstein did not take his readings from the Latin translation.

PAGE 483.

77. Our author having summed up his evidence, now passes sentence upon Wetstein; but before we absolutely condemn him, let us recollect that of the eighteen examples, which our author has produced in the last six or seven pages as proofs of Wetstein's negligence, thirteen are decidedly false, and the fourteenth doubtful.

PAGE 484.

78. Our author here acknowledges that Acts ii: 25. as quoted by Theophylact, differs not from the common

text, and yet censures Wetstein for not producing a various reading. That Theophylact, after having quoted *εσι*, comments on the passage, as if *εση* were used, is nothing to the purpose; for it was the business of Wetstein to select from Theophylact the words, which he actually quoted from the Greek Testament, not to form readings from the construction which was given them by the Greek father. The fact is simply this: Theophylact quotes from his manuscript of the Acts of the Apostles *οτι εκ δεξιων μὲν εστιν*, and after having quoted several verses more, says in his commentary, when he comes to treat of the passage in question, *το δε εκ δεξιων εσαναι τον πατερα, κ.τ.λ.* Theophylact. in Actus Apost. p. 36. editio Sifani. Coloniae 1567. The Greek father therefore has used *εσαναι* as equivalent to *ειναι*: but we cannot therefore conclude that he found *εση* for *εσι* in any Greek manuscript of the Acts of the Apostles.

79. It is true that Theophylact (p. 51. ed. Sifani) quotes *οι ιερεις και ο γρατος τε ιερε*. But it is probable that *γρατος* is here either an erratum of the transcriber, who wrote the manuscript of Theophylact used by Sifanus, or a typographical error for *γρατηγος*: for Theophylact, in explaining these words in his Commentary, says, *συν αυλοις δε φησι και ο γρατηγος τε ιερε*, and where the same subject occurs again, ch. v. 26. he has in the text itself *τοτε απελθων ο γρατηγος συν τοις υπηρεταις, κ.τ.λ.* Vid. p. 61. ed. Sifani.

80. Wetstein is not to be censured for quoting *μελωκησεν*, though, when it is followed by *αυλον*, the grammatical construction is irregular. An impartial collector of various readings produces the evidence which he finds, without inquiring into relations, or dependencies. An erroneous reading leads frequently to the discovery of the genuine text, and *μελωκησεν αυλον* is not unworthy of notice, as appears from its being actually the reading of the Cod. Cantabrigiensis, and Laudanus 3.

81. Sifanus has actually printed *εν τω σπερματι*, but says in his Note, ‘in apographo est *και το σπερμα*.’ Vid. p. 69. ed. Sifani.

82. Wet-

82. Wetstein therefore could not quote Theophylact in its favour.

83. This omission is supplied by Griesbach.

PAGE 485.

84. Most of the examples here quoted by our author may be seen in the translator's Notes to the sixth chapter of this Introduction.

PAGE 486.

85. This painful task has been reserved for the translator, who has submitted to the drudgery of comparing almost every quotation with the quoted originals. Many have been noted in the course of these remarks, but a much greater number has been tacitly corrected, especially in references to the Bible. Our author is no more entitled to excuse than Wetstein, for of the numerous errata in the German original a great part may be rather ascribed to the writer, than to the printer; and like those of Wetstein, are frequently of such a nature, that they not only correct not themselves, but leave those readers in the dark, who would examine the subject more minutely. It is true that several are noted in the list at the end of the work, but these are either trifles, or correct themselves; while those are totally neglected, where labour is required to detect and amend them. It is not however my intention to censure our author, but to apologize for Wetstein, since I have the same indulgence to request of the public: and if the former has so great a number of mistakes in making three or four thousand quotations, we must surely make allowance for a critic, who has produced above a million.

86. This is a single instance in support of the charge of Wetstein's inaccuracy in his Prolegomena. See Note 126. to ch. viii. sect. 6.

PAGE 487.

87. It cannot be denied that these two errata are really in Wetstein's text; but the very circumstance, which

our author mentions as a mean of increasing the confusion, really corrects the two errata. It is well known that when Wetstein quotes a various reading to any word of the text, he repeats that word where he quotes his readings. Now in the first instance he repeats δ , in the latter $\eta\mu\omega\nu$: the repetition therefore corrects, not increases the mistake.

88. Here therefore we can correct Wetstein from Mill, from whose quotation it appears that 28. in Wetstein's quotation is an erratum for 26.

PAGE 488.

89. It is true, that if Wetstein, in imitation of Mill, had quoted his MSS. by name, instead of referring to them by letters or figures, the references would have been attended with fewer errata. But his various readings, instead of filling, as at present, a fourth, or at the utmost a third part of each page, would then have occupied as much space as is now allotted both to various readings and remarks, and he must have either omitted those profoundly learned and valuable Notes, with which no expositor of the New Testament can dispense, or have swelled his work to double the size.

90. How ungrounded this conclusion is, appears from Note 61.

PAGE 489.

91. This four-fold notation is certainly attended with inconvenience, but on the other hand it has its advantages: for Wetstein had two objects in view in affixing letters and cyphers to his manuscripts. 1. As a mean of referring to them. 2. As a mean of determining the number which he used in each part: and this last object is of the greatest importance, in determining the proportion of evidence for and against a reading.

92. The difficulties, of which our author complains in this paragraph, are not so great as he represents; and they may be greatly diminished, or even reduced to nothing, by a very simple method, which I have found
of

of great service in the use of Wettstein's Greek Testament. A single folio page, if written closely, is sufficient to contain a transcript of Wettstein's four catalogues of MSS. prefixed to each of the four parts of his Greek Testament. This transcript, if placed on the desk, whenever the invaluable work in question is an object of study, will enable the reader at a single view to decypher each of the references, and after moderate practice to retain in his memory the marks, by which at least the principal manuscripts are denoted.

93. The principal objection, which I would make to Wettstein, is, not that he is deficient in point of accuracy, for perfect accuracy is not to be expected in so extensive a work, in which it is wholly impossible for the attention to be always awake, but that he too frequently violates the rules of propriety and good breeding. Woide therefore was not unjust, in saying in his preface to the *Codex Alexandrinus*, § 68. *Doctrinam ei concedo, et literas, et diligentiam, et multiplicem lectionem: sed mansuetudinem, humanitatem, candorem in Prolegomenis ejus desidero.*

PAGE 490.

94. Here follows in the German original a long account of Bentley's intended edition of the Greek Testament, and of the controversy which was conducted between him and Middleton on that occasion. But as the subject itself is of little importance, because Bentley's plan was never put into execution; and as those, whose curiosity may lead them to inquire into the history of Bentley's proposals, and the opposition with which they met from Middleton, may derive better information from the publications of the time, than can be expected from the work of a foreigner, I have taken the liberty to omit the whole description. Those who wish to see a short account of this intended edition, may consult Wettstein's *Prolegomena*, p. 153.

GRIESBACH'S EDITION.

95. Properly speaking, Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament has been printed only once: for the first publication was nothing more than a Synopsis, or Harmony of the Gospels. His edition of the Greek Testament consists of two volumes 8vo. printed at Halle, the one in 1775, the other in 1777. A new edition, with extracts from two hundred MSS. in addition to those quoted in the former, has been lately published. These additional manuscripts are those, which have been collated by Matthäi, Alter, Birch, Moldenhawer, &c. and of which an account has been given in the Notes to ch. viii. sect. 6.

96. He has also inserted the extracts from the two Wolfenbüttel manuscripts collated by Knittel, and those of the Codex Gießensis, and some other manuscripts which he collated in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum. He has himself very accurately collated all those Latin versions, which were published by Sabatier and Blanchini, and the mistakes which had been made by Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, in the quotations from the Oriental versions, he has corrected, by the assistance of Bode's *Pseudo-critica Millio-Bengeliana*. See Griesbach's Pref. to the first Vol. of his Greek Testament, p. 16—19.

PAGE 491.

97. Our author should have produced at least two or three examples, in which Wetstein quotes a manuscript for the addition of *ευθως*, where it is not in the common text of St. Mark's Gospel, and which is omitted by Griesbach. I have found several instances where Wetstein quotes MSS. or versions for the omission of *ευθως*, e. g. ch. i. 16. 29. 31. ii. 43, &c. but none for the insertion of *ευθως*, which is hardly to be expected from any transcriber, since according to the common and probably genuine text, it occurs not less than forty times, which is

as

as frequently as in all the other books in the Greek Testament put together. I have found none that is omitted by Griesbach.

98. If Griesbach had quoted the Cod. Veronensis and Brixienfis in support of the reading $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$, in opposition to $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, of the neglect of which our author complains, he would have quoted erroneously; for these MSS. have not *nisi*, but *sed*. See Blanchini Evang. Quadruplex, P. I. p. 345.

PAGE 492.

99. See Note 263. to ch. viii. sect. 6.

100. Our author should have mentioned these ancient and important authorities in favour of $\alpha\gamma\rho\omicron\nu$, for Wetstein quotes only the Codex Mori, and alleges not a single father, nor a single version. Perhaps the old Syriac version is meant by our author, which has ܐܓܪܘܡ , and this is rendered in the Latin translation *agrum*; but it might be rendered with equal, if not more propriety, *agros*; for it is a nomen collectivum, its proper meaning being not *ager*, but *rus*: it includes therefore plures *agros*. See the Lex. Hept. p. 3432.

101. The value of Griesbach's edition is so decided, that it would be superfluous to expatiate on its merits. But lest the omissions, of which some complain, should be considered as blemishes, it may not be improper to consider the point of view, from which this excellent work should be examined. Now it was not the object of Griesbach to form a complete collection of all the various readings, which had been produced by Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, and to add the numerous extracts which he had made himself, but to give only a select and choice collection, omitting all such as were either trifling in themselves, and supported by little authority, or were evident corrections, errata, or interpolations: to one of which classes most of the examples belong, which have been alleged by our author in the last paragraph.

102. Griesbach has accurately collated not less than seventeen different copies of the Latin version. See the

the Preface to the first Vol. of his Greek Testament, p. 19, 23.

PAGE 493.

103. See Note 95.

MATTHÆI's EDITION.

104. See Note 229. to ch. viii. sect. 6. where these Moscow manuscripts are enumerated, at least those which contain the text of the Greek Testament.

105. The epistles to the Hebrews and Colossians were published in 1784, and last of all the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark in 1788, making in all twelve vols.

PAGE 494.

106. To the critical editions of the Greek Testament, which have been enumerated by our author, may be added the following:

1. *Novum Testamentum ad Codicem Vindobonensem Græce expressum: Varietatem lectionis addidit Franciscus Carolus Alter Prof. Gymnasii Vindobonensis, Tom. I. 1787, Tom. II. 1786, 8vo.*

The plan, on which this critical edition is formed, differs entirely from that which was adopted by Mill, Wettstein, and Griesbach. The text is printed separately, the various readings at the end, and these again are not arranged as in the above-mentioned editions, but a separate place is allotted to the collection of extracts from each manuscript and version. The text, which he has adopted, and with which he has collated his MSS. is that of the Codex Lambecii 1. in the Imperial library at Vienna, and which he terms in the title *κκτ' εἰσχον*, Codex Vindobonensis. But wherever he discovered manifest errata, he has corrected them from the edition of Robert Stephens, printed in 1546, and has subjoined at the end of each volume a list of these errata, under the title *Vitia Codicis Vindobonensis*. In the book of Revelation it has four chasins, which he has supplied from the

the Codex Neffellii 302. The MSS. which he has collated with this adopted text, have been already described in the Notes to the eighth chapter of this Introduction, under the title *Codices Vindobonenses*. See the Note 369. The versions which he has collated are the Coptic, the Slavonian, and the Latin. In the collation of the Coptic he has used the edition of Wilkins, from which he has given complete extracts of the four Gospels in his first volume; but those which he has produced from the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation, are not printed separately, according to his general plan, but must be sought among the extracts from the three Greek manuscripts, Codex 15. in auctario Forlosiæ, Codex Lambecii 28. and Codex Lambecii 248. Of the Slavonian version he has given extracts from three Imperial manuscripts of the Gospels, one of which is only a fragment, and from one of the Acts and the Epistles; he has also collated the Moscow edition of 1614, in the fourteen first chapters of St. John. His extracts from the Latin version are taken from two Imperial MSS. the one of the Gospels, the other of the Acts and the Epistles.

It is in general acknowledged that this edition has been executed with great care and diligence, and as it contains the readings of manuscripts which had been hitherto totally neglected, or very superficially examined, it is a work with which no man engaged in sacred criticism can dispense. Its use however is attended with the two following inconveniences: The text which has been preferred by the editor, and to which his various readings are adapted, being that of neither Mill nor Wettstein, but of a manuscript, which seems by no means entitled to the honour of forming the basis of an edition of the Greek Testament, the accommodation of his extracts to those of Mill and Wettstein, to which they are properly supplements, is attended with uncertainty, because they relate to different texts. Nor is the arrangement itself attended with less inconvenience; for the extracts from each manuscript and version being printed apart, it is necessary, whenever we would examine the evidence which

which he has produced for or against a reading, to consult as many different parts of the volume, as the editor has collated manuscripts and versions. The first inconvenience is not to be remedied without a totally new collation, but it is to be hoped that the learned editor himself will correct the latter, and adopt the usual plan, if his work should survive a re-impression, to which it is justly entitled.

2. Quatuor Evangelia Græce, cum variantibus a textu lectionibus Codd. MSS: Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, Barberinæ, Laurentianæ, Vindobonensis, Escorialensis, Havniensis regiæ, quibus accedunt lectiones versionum Syrarum, Veteris, Philoxenianæ, et Hierosolymitanæ, jussu et sumptibus regiis edidit Andreas Birch. Havniæ 1788, fol. et 4to.

This splendid and valuable work, which contains the result of the united labours of Professors Birch, Alter, and Moldenhawer, who at the expence of the present King of Denmark have travelled into Germany, Italy, France, and Spain, in order to examine and collate the precious remains of sacred antiquity, is one of the most important productions, that have been lately exhibited in the province of biblical literature. The editor, Professor Birch of Copenhagen, has himself collated all the Greek manuscripts which are quoted, except the Codices Escorialenses, which were collated by Professor Moldenhawer. They are described at large in the Prolegomena, and have been enumerated in the notes to the eighth chapter of this Introduction, under the Codices Barberini, Sti Basilii Romæ, Bononiensis, Borgiani, Escorialenses, Florentini, Stæ Mariæ in Vallicella, Vaticani, Venetiani, Vindobonenses, and Zeladæ. The part which Professor Adler has taken in this work, consists in the extracts from the Syriac versions, especially the Syra Hierosolimitana, which he himself discovered, and has described in the third part of his Versiones Syriacæ, from which I have given an extract in Note 5. to chap. vii. sect. 12. The text, which the learned editor has adopted, is the same which was printed by Mill, namely, the third edition

edition of Robert Stephens, for which he has assigned his reasons in the preface prefixed to his *Prolegomena*. He has followed also the example of Mill, in quoting his manuscripts not by letters, or by numbers, but by an abbreviation of their names, and has improved the plan of his predecessor, by annexing to each abbreviation, not an arbitrarily adopted number, but that very number, which is affixed to them in the respective libraries in which they are preserved. This is a very great advantage, for by these means we become as it were acquainted with each evidence that is produced: nor is it attended with that inconvenience, to which Wetstein would have been exposed, had he adopted a similar plan, because his more extensive scheme included all the known manuscripts of the Greek Testament, whereas the edition in question, which is a supplement to Wetstein, contains the readings of those only, which had been wholly neglected, or very imperfectly collated. The great value of this splendid work, and in which it surpasses all former editions, consists in the very complete extracts which are given from the celebrated Cod. Vaticanus, marked in the Vatican library N^o. 1209. a manuscript, which, though probably of more importance than any now existing, had been so neglected, that the few and imperfect extracts which had been made, induced Wetstein to entertain an unfavourable opinion of it. Another material advantage, peculiar to this edition, consists in the extracts from the *Versio Syra Hierosolymitana*, the readings of which very frequently confirm those of the *Codex Cantabrigiensis*, where it is wholly unsupported by other authority, a circumstance which shews the value and antiquity, not so much of the manuscripts themselves, but of the text which they contain.

Another volume was published by Birch at Copenhagen in 1798, containing various readings to the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles. But they are not accompanied with the text.

3. Η *καινη διασκηνη*. The New Testament, collated with the most approved manuscripts, with select notes
in

in English, critical and explanatory, by E. Harwood, D.D. London 1776, 1784, 2 vols. 12mo.

This edition, though not mentioned by our author, is certainly entitled to a place among the critical editions of the Greek Testament, though it is not accompanied with various readings: for though Dr. Harwood has adopted the common text as the basis of his own, he has made critical corrections, wherever the received reading appeared to him to be erroneous. The manuscripts which he has generally followed, when he departs from the common text, are the Cantabrigiensis in the Gospels and the Acts, the Claromontanus in the Epistles of St. Paul. In the preface to the first volume, p. 7. after having described them, as approaching the nearest of any manuscripts now known in the world to the original text of the sacred records, he adds, ‘Accordingly in this edition these have been most commonly followed; but the different lections they exhibit have never been adopted blindly or implicitly. In many places these two manuscripts are mutilated and defective; several leaves, several chapters are wanting; in which case the readings of other manuscripts, particularly the Alexandrine, have been espoused. The common text has never been deserted without reasons, which appeared to me to justify such a departure, and no innovations have been introduced from precipitancy or affectation. Conjectural emendations I have exploded, nothing of this nature, however plausible and ingenious, being admissible, when, through the providence of God, such a number of very ancient and venerable manuscripts have been transmitted to us. Not a single word in any one important point has been inserted in this edition, but what is supported by the best manuscripts.’

It is therefore not improbable that this critical edition contains more of the ancient and genuine text of the Greek Testament, than those which are in common use: but as no single manuscript, however ancient and venerable, is entitled to such a preference as to exclude the rest, and no critic of the present age can adopt a new
reading,

reading, unless the general evidence be produced, and the preponderancy in its favour distinctly shewn, the learned and ingenious editor has in some measure defeated his own object, and rendered his labours less applicable to the purposes of sacred criticism.

S E C T. II.

PAGE 495.

1. The liberties which Griesbach has taken, are such as are warranted by the strictest rules of criticism. See his preface to the second volume of his Greek Testament, p. 13—16.

2. It will be therefore necessary, whenever our author complains of imperfections observable in all the editions of the Greek Testament, to take notice of such as cannot be attributed to Griesbach.

3. By the four principal editions, our author means the Complutensian, and the editions of Erasmus, Robert Stephens, and Beza.

PAGE 496.

4. ΠΑΥΤΟΘΕΥ is rejected by Griesbach.

PAGE 497.

5. Griesbach has rejected it from the text of his edition.

PAGE 498.

6. For that reason, these words also are rejected by Griesbach.

S E C T. III.

PAGE 499.

1. The most copious collection of readings is that which has been given by Wettstein, but these readings
 VOL. II. K k k are

are not accommodated to the third edition of Stephens ; Wetstein having adopted the editio recepta.

PAGE 500.

2. Griesbach has prescribed to himself rules equally severe with those recommended by our author ; for he has admitted critical conjecture in no instance whatsoever, and where he has expunged, corrected, or added, the evidence (which he has accurately produced) is, in point of authority, three and four-fold in his favour.

PAGE 502.

3. This is not applicable to Griesbach. See the following Note II.

4. Griesbach has collated them with great accuracy. See his Pref. to the first volume of his Greek Testament, p. 19.

PAGE 505.

5. The latter part of this paragraph our author should not have left, as it stood in the third edition, because he no longer suspects the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Codices Græco-Latini, of having been corrupted from the Latin.

PAGE 507.

6. But on the other hand, there is less danger of making mistakes in the substitution of figures for names, than in the substitution of names for figures. It would be therefore more certain, as well as more easy, to adapt the notation of Mill to that of Wetstein, than the contrary. Another reason would be, that Wetstein quotes more than twice as many manuscripts as his predecessor.

7. It is true, that abbreviations are less exposed to errata than letters or figures ; but if the manuscripts were thus quoted in an edition of the Greek Testament, formed on that extensive plan which our author recommends, it would be swelled to several folio volumes.

8. Griesbach

8. Griesbach has very carefully distinguished the manuscripts of the Latin version, which he quotes to the number of seventeen. He has likewise quoted them in such a manner, that there is no danger of taking them for Greek manuscripts.

PAGE 508.

9. This has been done by Griesbach. See the Pref. to the first volume of his Greek Testament, p. 19.

10. This likewise has been performed by Griesbach: for instance, when he quotes the Greek text of the Cod. Cantabrigienfis, he quotes by the mark D.; when he means the Latin text, he quotes by the abbreviation Cant.

11. In regard to the Arabic, our author complains in another part of his Introduction, that the Roman, Polyglot, and Erpenian editions, are not distinguished from each other in the quotations from this version. But Griesbach quotes them distinctly, and separately, by the title, Ar. Rom.—Ar. Pol.—Ar. Erp., and when all three coincide, by the abbreviation Arr.

PAGE 509.

12. For those, who are endued with such ignorance, as our author here represents, there is no cure, and therefore no deviation from the common plan is on that account necessary. Besides, critical editions are intended only for men, who are acquainted with the subject: and those, who are ignorant of it, should be initiated in the science, before they presume to form a judgement.

13. To set this matter in a clear light, let us compare the manuscripts which Wettstein has quoted in favour of the omission of Acts ix. 5, 6. with those which he passes over in silence, and for the sake of brevity, confine the comparison to those which are written in uncial letters. These in the Acts of the Apostles amount only to seven, which Wettstein has noted A. B. C. D. E. F. G. Of these seven, he quotes for the omission of the passage in question only A. C. E.; but Cod. B. had been at

κ κ κ 2

that

that time very superficially collated, the Codd. D. and F. contain not this passage, and of the Cod. G. he had only a few extracts, which he had taken from Blanchini: these four therefore, as far as relates to Wetstein, are neutral. It appears then that a knowledge of these circumstances alone enables us to decide on the present reading, for of these seven witnesses, three only (at least in Wetstein) are entitled to a voice, and these three condemn it.

14. We must not however conclude that Wetstein's plan is faulty, because his meaning has been mistaken. By our author's assertion, that Acts x. 6. is contained in no manuscript whatsoever, must be understood, that it has been hitherto quoted from no manuscript.

15. It appears therefore, from the evidence which Wetstein has produced, that of sixty-nine, forty-five are against the common reading; and if from the twenty-four, which remain, we deduct those, which are here defective, or have not been consulted on this passage, the superiority of evidence in favour of the omission is so great, as to render quotations on the other side of the question, if any can be produced, entirely superfluous.

PAGE 510.

16. Our author here discovers a light in Bengel, with respect to a passage, which he says Wetstein had left in obscurity. But the real fact is, that Wetstein has brought the matter much nearer to a state of certainty, than Bengel. The latter quotes, for the insertion of *καί*, those manuscripts which had been alleged by Mill, to which he adds the few which he himself collated: but quotes none for the omission of this reading, because he knew of none that omitted it. Wetstein has done the very same, and has even augmented the number of manuscripts in favour of the insertion. The superiority therefore is on the side of Wetstein. Our author's conclusion, that the reading in question is omitted in no manuscript, because Bengel has quoted none in support of the omission, is wholly erroneous, for Bengel's evidence is here negative;

negative ; he quotes none, because he knows of none, which every reader might have done, as easily as Bengel. And, what renders the conclusion still more extraordinary, is, that Wettstein has clearly decided that the reading is not in the Codex Claromontanus a prima manu, for he expressly quotes it as inserted in the Cod. D. ex emendatione, and this has been confirmed by Griesbach. Further, as Wettstein has quoted, in this passage, no other manuscript in uncial letters than the Claromontanus, it might have been reasonably concluded, that in those, which have been carefully collated, and have no chasm in the passage, such as the Alexandrinus, and Boernerianus, the reading is omitted : and that this conclusion would have been just, appears from actual experience ; for it is not inserted in the Codex Alexandrinus, as may be seen on consulting the edition by Woide : and that it is not inserted in the Cod. Boernerianus, appears from the edition by Matthäi, fol. 3.

17. Remarks similar to those which were made at the end of the preceding Note, are likewise applicable to this example.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the marks of distinction, and divisions of the Greek Testament.

PAGE 511.

1. The person who first distinguished the several parts of a period in Greek writing, by the introduction of a point, was Aristophanes of Byzantium, who lived in the hundred and forty-fifth Olympiad, under Ptolemæus Epiphanes, King of Egypt. See Montfaucon Palæographia Græca, p. 31. But though Aristophanes of Byzantium was the first person, who applied points to the purpose of marking the divisions of the sense, yet points

κ κ κ 3

are

are found in inscriptions written upwards of four hundred years before the birth of Christ. See Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 135.

2. The treatise of Diomedes de oratione is printed in the following work, *Grammaticæ Latinæ auctores antiqui, Opera et studio Helii Putschii, Hanoviæ, 1605, 4to.* The place, where Diomedes speaks of the division of discourse into parts is p. 460, 461. but he is totally silent as to the mark, or marks, by which those divisions were noted. The words of Dionysius Thrax, (Fabricii *Bibl. Græca*, T. VII. p. 27.) on which the opinion is founded, that a point, when placed at the top of the line, corresponded to our full stop, when placed in the middle to our semicolon, and when placed at the bottom of the line to our comma, are the following: *Στιγμαὶ εἰσι τρεῖς· τελεία, μέση, υποσίγμα. Καὶ ἡ μὲν τελεία σίγμα ἐστὶ διανοίας ἀπηρτισμένης σημεῖον. Μέση δὲ σημεῖον πνεύματος ἐνεκεν παραλαμβανόμενον. Ὑποσίγμα δὲ διανοίας μὴδεῖα ἀπηρτισμένης, ἀλλ' ἐτι ἐνδεσθῆς σημεῖον.* Dionysius then proceeds, *Πῇ διαφέρει σίγμα υποσίγματος; Χρονῶ· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ σίγμα πολὺ τὸ διάστημα, ἐν δὲ τῇ υποσίγμα πάντεως ὀλίγον.* Now the expressions *μέση σίγμα* and *υποσίγμα* are interpreted by Montfaucon, (*Palæogr.* p. 31.) as well as by our author, ‘a point placed in the middle of the line,’ and, ‘a point placed at the bottom of the line,’ and of course *τελεία σίγμα* is taken to signify ‘a point at the top of the line.’ This interpretation derives great probability from the circumstance, that a point of only one shape, namely that of our full stop, was used, as appears from the most ancient manuscripts, and inscriptions, and of course that its position only could form a ground of distinction into the three degrees of *σίγμα*, *μέση σίγμα*, and *υποσίγμα*. But on the other hand it may be said, 1. That different degrees of pause may exist, without any difference in the position of the point, which is used to denote the pause, or even without any point at all, as was the case before the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium. 2dly, That the words of Dionysius, ‘full stop,’ ‘intermediate stop,’ and ‘inferior stop’,

stop,' are too ambiguous to lead to any positive conclusion with respect to the position of the point, because they may relate only to the degrees of pause; and Dionysius himself, in answer to the question, 'how does the *συγμη* differ from the *υποσυγμη*?' replies only, 'by a different degree of pause,' but is totally silent as to any difference in the position of the point expressive of that pause. 3dly, That if it had ever been the custom of the Greeks, to place a point at the top, in the middle, or at the bottom of the line, according as the sense was more or less complete, some traces of this custom would still be visible in our ancient manuscripts, and inscriptions. But in some of these the point is placed in general at the top of the line, that is, on a level with the upper stroke of the letters, in others usually in the middle; but I have found none, in which the three degrees of pause are denoted by the point being placed at the top, in the middle, and at the bottom of the line. In the Codex Alexandrinus the point is in general at the top of the line, whether it corresponds to our comma, colon, or full stop. I have examined the whole of St. John's Gospel in this manuscript, without finding the point placed on a level with the middle of the word in a single instance; and I observed only five examples where it was placed at the bottom. Two of them are unconnected with the present inquiry, for they merely denote abbreviations, thus, $\overline{\text{TM}}$. John v. 19. and $\overline{\text{HM}}$. John ix. 20. The other three were probably placed at the bottom by mere accident: but if they were placed there by design, they are unfavourable to the hypothesis, that a point at the bottom of the line denoted the shortest pause, because two of these examples are at the end of Ammonian sections, namely those marked \times and $\mu\zeta$; and the third, though not at the end of an Ammonian section, is at the end of a sentence, (John ii. 5.) and is followed by an interval, or blank space. In the Codex Bezae I have observed no instance of a single point at the bottom of the line: it is

sometimes placed in the middle, sometimes at the top, but apparently without any plan, or view of ascertaining the degrees of pause.

PAGE 512.

3. Our author is not quite accurate in saying that the most ancient manuscripts have no points. It is true that in the fac simile of the Cod. Alexandrinus given by Montfaucon, Palæogr. p. 214. and of the Vaticanus by Blanchini, Evangelicar. Quadr. P. I. p. 492. pl. 1. we find no points: yet that they are used in the former appears from Woide's edition, and that they are found in the latter, though not frequently, is related by Birch in his Prolegomena, p. 14. The Codex Ephrem likewise has points, as appears from the fac simile given by Montfaucon in his Palæographia, p. 214. The only two very ancient manuscripts in uncial letters, which I have had an opportunity of examining in the original are the Codex Bezae and the Codex Alexandrinus; and in both of these points are certainly found. In the Alexandrinus the six first lines of St. John's Gospel, are pointed thus:

ΕΝΑΡΧΗΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΣΚΑΙΟΛΟΓΟΣΗΝ
ΠΡΟΣΤΟΝΘΝ·ΚΑΙΘΣΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΣ·
ΟΤΤΟΣΗΝΕΝΑΡΧΗΠΡΟΣΤΟΝΘΝ
ΠΑΝΤΑΔΙΑΥΤΟΤΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ·ΚΑΙΧΩ
ΡΕΙΣΑΥΤΟΤΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΟΥΔΕΕΝ·
ΟΓΕΓΟΝΕΝΕΝΑΥΤΩΖΩΗΗΝ·

Of these five points there are only three in the same passage in the Codex Bezae, (I speak here from my own examination of the MS.) viz. the 2d. 4th. and 5th. which are placed in the same manner as in the Codex Alexandrinus. Perhaps however there was a point originally after the first ΘΝ, as in the Alexandrinus; for the MS. is at present so effaced at that spot, that the two last strokes of the N are no longer visible. It is remarkable that these two manuscripts agree in pointing a part of this passage, which corresponds to the 3d. and 4th. verses,

verses, so as to give it a sense different from that which is expressed in our printed editions. These have *Χωρίς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο ἔδῃ ἐν ὃ γεγονέν· ἐν αὐτῇ ζῶν, κ.τ.λ.* In the Cod. Alex. and Cod. Bezae we find *Χωρίς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο ἔδῃ ἐν ὃ γεγονέν ἐν αὐτῇ ζῶν, κ. τ. λ.* That the points were written a *primâ manu* even in the Codex Bezae appears from the circumstance, that where they are found, there is a greater interval between the letters, than where they are not found.

PAGE 513.

4. See Note 35 and 36 to this chapter.

5. In the Codex Alexandrinus, in the Gospels the blank spaces or intervals are found at the end of each Ammonian section, and no where else. In the Acts and Epistles likewise they are regularly at the end of each section.

PAGE 514.

6. Instead of separating the clause *καὶ δεόμενος τῷ Θεῷ διαπαντός* from the other clauses, which are expressive of the good qualities of Cornelius, perhaps it would be better to omit *ἣν* in the first verse on the authority of the Alexandrinus, Ephrem, Laudianus 3. and many other Greek manuscripts, and point the passage in the following manner: *Ἄνθρωπε τίς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ὀνόματι Κορνήλιος, ἑκατοντάρχης ἐκ σπειρῆς τῆς καλεμένης Ἰταλικῆς, εὐσεβὴς, καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ποιοῦν τε ἐλεημοσύνας πολλὰς τῷ λαῷ, καὶ δεόμενος τῷ Θεῷ διαπαντός, εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι κ.τ.λ.*

PAGE 515.

7. Wetstein, in his Prolegomena, p. 73. relates that Euthalius published an edition of the Acts of the Apostles, and all the Epistles, and adds, *Libros istos etiam σιχηδὸν scripsit, id est ita ut singulæ lineæ singulas sententias absolvent, eaque distinctione lectores scire possent, quæ continuo spiritu legerent, et ubi paulum intermitterent.* He then quotes his authority for the assertion that

that Euthalius first divided these books into *συχοι* or lines. *Πρωτον δὲ ἐν ἐγῶνι τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βιβλὸν συχῆδον ἀναγνῶς τε καὶ γραψας, κ.τ.λ.*

The Codex Bezae is written in these *συχοι* or lines^a, and that the reader may have a notion of this manner of writing, I will copy the six first lines of the Acts of the Apostles.

ΤΟΝ ΜΕΝ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΑΜΗΝ

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑΝΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΦΙΛΕ

ΩΝ ΗΡΞΑΤΟ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΠΟΙΕΙΝΤΕ

ΚΑΙ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΙΝ ΑΧΡΙ ΗΣΗΜΕΡΑΣ

ΑΝΕΛΗΜΦΘΗ ΕΝΤΕΙΛΑΜΕΝΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ

ΔΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΣΕΞΕΛΕΞΑΤΟ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΕΛΕΥΣΕ

ΚΗΡΥΣΣΕΙΝ ΤΟ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

The Codex Claromontanus and Codex Sangermanensis are likewise written in these *συχοι* or lines. See Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 216. 219. But in the Cod. Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Ephrem, no such distinction is visible, the lines being all of the same length. See Woide's edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, Blanchini *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, P. I. p. 492. pl. 1. and Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 214.

8. Montfaucon, in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 32. says; *Virgulæ, si non priscae omnino vetustatis sunt, non tamen eas ita recentes dixeris: nam in Codicibus Græcis annorum plus mille occurrunt, ad omnium minimam distinctionem positæ, et quidem formâ hodiernæ ita simili, ut nihil intersit discriminis.* P. 224. he has given a fac simile of a manuscript of the Septuagint written in the

^a To the arguments which have been produced in the 122d. Note to ch. viii. sect. 6. to shew that the Codex Bezae was not written before the time of Euthalius, this may likewise be added, as an additional proof.

eighth century, and with uncial letters, in which we find the mark called comma. But of all the specimens of manuscripts written in uncial letters, which Montfaucon has given in his *Palæographia*, this is the only one in which this mark is found. Nor does it appear to have been used in general, even at the first introduction of the smaller letters. See the *Palæographia*, p. 274—308. and the end of the first paragraph of the following Note 10.

9. *Puncta interrogandi, quæ hodie hoc modo effinguntur (;), in codicibus vetustissimis unciali quadro caractere scriptis, quos usquam viderim, absunt: in aliis vero noni, decimi, et undecimi sæculi habentur. Palæographia Græc. p. 32.*

10. In the *Codex Alexandrinus*, the mark used to denote the divisions of the sense, is in general the point, which we call full stop, as may be seen on consulting Woide's edition. This point is usually placed on a level with the upper stroke of the letters, whether it is put where we should use a full stop, colon, or comma. It is true that a mark, of the shape of our comma, or rather of our apostrophe, is sometimes found in the *Codex Alexandrinus*. But that it was not intended as a mark to divide the sense appears from the very mode of using it, for it is sometimes placed where no pause whatsoever can take place. For instance Mark xi. 32. ΑΠΑΝΤΕΣΓΑΡ'ΕΙΧΟΝ. Luke iii. 9. ΕΙΣΠΥΡ'ΒΑΛΛΕΤΑΙ. At other times it is placed in the middle of a word as ΓΑ'ΔΑΡΗΝΩΝ Luke viii. 26. so that it is difficult to determine what was the design of the writer, or whether he had any design at all. Our author who asserts that the *Cod. Alex.* has not only the full stop, comma, and colon, but likewise a kind of semicolon, seems to have misunderstood the following passage in Woide's Preface, § 30. *Punctum, Colon, Semicolon, et Comma, vel punctulo (.), vel breviori lineola (-), superiori parti literarum, vel medio earundem apposita, indicatur.* It is clear that Woide did not mean to say that the four different kinds of stops were denoted by four different marks, for in this sentence

sentence he produces only two. Woide does not determine to which of the four kinds of stops these marks respectively correspond; nor does it appear from an examination of the Codex Alexandrinus that the writer of it intended to make any distinction between these two marks. The latter occurs much less frequently than the former: but where it is used it is placed at the top of the line, and applied exactly in the same manner as the point sometimes where the sense is perfect, at other times where it is imperfect. They likewise resemble each other so nearly in shape, as well as in use, that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the one from the other. It appears therefore that they are only one and the same mark, and that whether it is pointed, or whether it is dilated, is owing to no other circumstance, than the greater or less pressure of the pen of the writer. The system of punctuation was at that time not reduced to the same degree of refinement, as it has been in modern ages. In the Greek manuscripts in general no other mark of pause is used than that of a simple point; and I have seen one written so late as the end of the fifteenth century by Jerom of Sparta, in the University Library of Cambridge, and marked Ll. 2. 13. in which there is no other mark of pause; and in this manuscript it is in general placed at the top of the line.

Before I conclude this article, it is necessary to take notice of an inaccuracy in Woide's expression '*superiori parti literarum, vel medio earundem apposita.*' Now whoever examines the Codex Alexandrinus will rarely find an instance, in which the point is placed on a level with the middle of the letters, except in those few cases where a line ends with a word written in smaller characters, when the point sometimes receives a proportional depression. I have likewise observed one or two instances where the short line is placed in the middle, but without any visible reason. The deviation therefore from its common place in those few instances must be ascribed, not to design, but to accident, or want of attention in the writer.

PAGE 516.

11. See Bowyer's Preface to his third edition, p. vi.
 12. See Note 3.
 13. This person is at present known to be Markland, whose name is written at full length in the last edition of Bowyer's critical conjectures.

PAGE 519.

14. But if *διναίω* is not used in the sense of *punio* in the New Testament, and the Septuagint, this conjecture rests on very uncertain ground.

PAGE 520.

15. One of the oldest of the manuscripts written in uncial letters, in which the words are distinctly divided, is the Codex Augiensis, supposed to have been written in the ninth century. In this manuscript, which is now preserved in the library of Trinity College in Cambridge, the words are not only distinctly divided by intervals or blank spaces, but to make the distinction more conspicuous, a point is added at the end of each word. But though it was not usual in manuscripts written before the ninth century to distinguish the words by leaving an interval between them, yet the mode itself was not entirely new, for Montfaucon, in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 134. has given a Greek inscription, engraved 450 years before the birth of Christ, in which the words are not only separated from each other, but distinguished by three points placed perpendicularly, in the following manner.

EN : TO : AYTO : ENIAYTO :

16. The verb *ᾠπεω* is used in not a single instance, either in the New Testament or in the Septuagint, as may be seen on consulting Trommius's Concordance, and Schmid's *Ταμειον*. This renders our author's conjecture very improbable: Nor does Stephens, in the place to which he refers, produce an instance even from a classic author ;

author; for he says only, *Præterea ab ὥρος* significante χρόνος est etiam verbum ὥρεω. Erotianus enim in suo lexico Hippocrat. ὥρεοντα exponit χρονίζοντα.

PAGE 521.

17. I have examined various Greek manuscripts, and a very great number of specimens of Greek hand-writing in Montfaucon's *Palæographia Græca*, his *Antiquité expliquée*, the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, *Astle's Origin and Progress of writing*, with many other authors on that subject, but I never met with an instance of a mark resembling the figure 6 to denote an iota either subscriptum or postscriptum.

18. Montfaucon, in his *Palæographia Græca*, p. 33. says, *Ιωτα subscriptum*, ut vocamus Græci, in marmoribus, tabulis, ac libris manuscriptis vulgo non indicant; vulgo dixi, nonnunquam enim adscribunt, sed post litteram cui adjungitur, et in serie aliarum litterarum, hoc pacto *τυχηι, οδωι*, ubi hodierno usu ita scribitur *τυχη, οδω*. In tabulis vero marmoreis vetustissimis, antequam usus litterarum *η* et *ω* advectus esset, incisis, ita scribitur *ΤΥΧΕΙ, ΟΔΟΙ*.

19. The Iota postscriptum, among the most ancient Greeks, formed probably an essential part of the word to which it belonged, for we find it in the most ancient monuments now extant. On a monument erected in the time of the Peloponnesian war we find, *ΕΝ ΤΟΙ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΙ, ΕΝ ΚΥΠΡΟΙ, ΕΝ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΙ, ΕΝ ΦΟΙΝΙΚΕΙ, &c.* See Montfaucon *Palæogr.* p. 134. Among the Oxford marbles likewise, there is a pillar on which is engraved a treaty made between the Smyræans and Magnesiens, 244 years before the birth of Christ, which begins with the words *ΕΔΘΞΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ*. See page 1. of the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, ex *Arundelianis*, *Seldenianis*, aliisque conflata. *Oxonii*, 1676. folio. See also Montfaucon *Antiquité expliquée*, Tom. II. p. 10. pl. 1. and his *Diarium Italicum*, p. 43. During two or three centuries after the birth of Christ, the iota postscriptum appears to have been in general, though not always, retained

tained in inscriptions. See the *Palæographia*, p. 168. At the same time it must be observed, that in the most ancient inscriptions we find it sometimes omitted, even in the same passage, where other words have it. For instance, in the inscription above-mentioned where we find EN TOI ΠΟΛΕΜΟΙ, &c. there is a few lines below EN TO ATTO ENIATTO. Gorius, in his *Inscriptiones antiquæ*, Tom. I. p. 297. has given an inscription from an ancient Sarcophagus, preserved at Florence, which begins with the words ΑΧΙΑΕΥΣ ΕΠΑΦΡΑ ΤΗ ΙΔΙΑ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΙ: and in a verse of Euripides found on a wall in the ruins of Herculaneum, $\nu\iota\kappa\tilde{\alpha}$ is written $\nu\iota\kappa\alpha$ without an Iota. See *Le pitture antiche d' Ercolano*. Tom. II. p. 34. The use of the Iota postscriptum appears to have gradually declined, and to have been in general not used after the fourth century. See the *Palæograph.* p. 174.

20. Nor is it found in the *Codex Bezaë*, the *Codex Vaticanus*, and other ancient manuscripts of the Greek Testament in uncial letters. But the conclusion, which our author draws at the end of this section, that the Apostles and Evangelists wrote without an Iota postscriptum, because it is not found in the most ancient manuscripts, is wholly ungrounded. It is omitted in these ancient manuscripts, not because its use was subsequent to the time when they were written, but because it was fallen into disuse before they were written, as appears from the preceding note. And since it was used in the very earliest ages, and was continued two or three centuries after the birth of Christ, it is by no means impossible that it was used by the Apostles and Evangelists. But as the Iota postscriptum was entirely dropped, and the Iota subscriptum which was afterwards substituted in its stead, was not introduced before the use of the small Greek letters, its position in modern manuscripts is not sufficient for determining any disputed point, which depends on the presence or absence of the Iota.

PAGE 522.

21. On an ancient Greek inscription, in the *Palæographia*, p. 135, N° 2. the article δ , $\delta\iota$, is written HO, HOI,

ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ is written EN TEI HOΔOI, and the H is retained as a mark of aspiration even in the middle of a word, if it is a compound, and the last word of which it is compounded begins with an aspirate: for instance, in the same inscription ἐνοδία is written ENHOΔΙΑ.

22. It is probable that the most ancient Greeks did not neglect in general to denote the aspiration by the letter H. On the monument erected in the Peloponnesian war (Palæogr. p. 135, N^o. 1.) οἰδε is written HOIDE. But the letter H as an aspirate appears to have fallen into disuse so early as the first century, as appears from the inscription erected in the time of Tiberius, given in the Palæographia, p. 148. where ἱερεὺς and ὑπάτης are written ΙΕΡΕΥΣ and ΥΠΑΤΟΥ. Hence the reason why no traces of it are to be found in any of our manuscripts.

23. While the Greeks denoted their spiritus asper by the letter H, its absence was a very sufficient indication of the spiritus lenis.

24. Our author has not given the two most ancient marks, by which the spiritus asper, and the spiritus lenis were denoted after the H, as a mark of aspiration had fallen into disuse. They are written, thus *ʀ* for the spiritus asper, and thus *ʁ* for the spiritus lenis, and were evidently formed from a division of the old mark H into two parts. See the Palæographia Græca, p. 33. where it appears that they were introduced by Aristophanes of Byzantium. In this shape they are found in general in such manuscripts in uncial letters, as are written with marks of aspiration. They are formed in this manner in the Codex Vaticanus, as appears from Birch's Prolegomena, p. 14. in the Claromontanus and Sangermanensis, as appears from the Palæographia, p. 216. 219: in this shape likewise they are found in the specimens, which I have seen in general in the Palæographia Græca and the Evangelium quadruplex. The mark *ʀ* evidently arose from leaving out a part of *ʀ*, and the semicircular figure *c* from hastily writing *ʀ*. The semicircular form is that which is found in the most modern manuscripts; and yet this very form is found in the Herculanean inscription mentioned.

mentioned at the end of Note 19. That in the shape of an L is found in very few : it is used however in the fragment belonging to Cardinal Borgia. See Georgi's Preface to his edition of the *Fragmentum Borgianum*, p. cxlvi.

PAGE 524.

26. Aristophanes Byzantinus *προσῳδία*ν five accentus excogitavit. Non quod ad illam usque ætatem Græca lingua accentibus et spiritibus caruerit : nulla enim potest lingua sine accentu et spiritu pronuntiari ; sed quod ille ea, quæ usus magister invexerat, ad certas normas et regulas deduxerit, signa et formas invenerit, quo loco essent constituendi accentus et spiritus docuerit. Montfaucon *Palæographia Græca*, p. 33.

27. The same sentiments are likewise entertained by Dr. Foster in his *Essay on the different nature of accent and quantity*. Eton 1763. 8vo. 2d. ed. It is probable likewise that the Romans made the same distinction between accent and quantity, as appears from the following passage in Quintilian *de institutione oratoriâ*, Lib. XI. cap. 3. p. 1000. ed. Burmann. *Præter illam differentiam, quæ est tripartita, acutæ, gravis, flexæ, tum intentis, tum remissis, tum elatis, tum inferioribus modis opus est, spatiis quoque lentioribus aut citatioribus.*

28. I have been told by the late learned Professor Reiz, that he had frequently heard Eugenius, a Greek Priest, who is now Archbp. of Cherson, read Greek verse, during his residence in Leipzig, that Eugenius distinctly marked by his pronunciation both accent and quantity ; lengthening the sound, without raising the tone of his voice, when he pronounced a long syllable which had not an acute accent, and raising the tone of his voice without lengthening the sound, when he pronounced a short syllable which had an acute accent ; in the same manner as in music, where the highest note in a bar is frequently the shortest. The opinion therefore advanced by Professor Gesner and Dr. Foster is not merely theoretical, since it is confirmed by actual experience. It must be observed however that an example of this kind is a pre-

sent very rare; for in general the modern Greeks pronounce according to accent alone. In England we have rejected the Greek accents, and pronounce, as it is generally supposed, according to quantity alone: but, paradoxical as the assertion may appear, we certainly do not. We still pronounce Greek according to accent, though the rules, which we follow, are different from those, which are observed by the Greeks themselves. For in reading Greek we follow the same rules with regard to the position of the tone, as in reading Latin; and in reading Latin words we do not regulate the tone of the voice merely by the length of the syllables. We pronounce for instance *vīrtūs*, *prāvūs*, *salūs*, *bōnūs*, precisely in the same manner, though these four words differ from each other in quantity. Again we make no difference in the pronunciation of *crīmīnīs*, *pātulīs*, *hōmīnīs*, *lūcidīs*, though these four words likewise differ from each other in quantity. Thirdly, we make no difference in the pronunciation of *vīrtūtīs*, *ēvulsī*, *rēmōtīs*, *dōcētīs*, though these again differ from each other in quantity. It is clear therefore that we are directed in placing the accent or in raising the tone of the voice, by some principle distinct from that of quantity: for in the twelve Latin words just mentioned there are twelve variations in quantity, but only three in accent; whereas, if we entirely followed quantity in placing the accent, the accent would vary as the quantity, and we should never accent a dactyl, and an anapaest in the same manner. Now the rule which has been laid down by the Latin grammarians, for the position of the accent in Latin words, a rule which we always follow though we are not always conscious of it, is the following. In Latin dissyllables the accent is always on the first syllable, whether it be long or short. In polysyllables, the accent is on the penultimate, if the penultimate be long, but if the penultimate be short, the accent is on the antepenultimate, whether the antepenultimate be long or short.' See Diomedes de accentibus. Lib. II. p. 426. printed in the *Grammaticæ latinæ auctores antiqui*, Opera et studio Heliae Putschii, Hanoviæ 1605.

4to. See also Quinctiliani Institutiones, Lib. I. cap. 5. p. 59. ed. Burmann. According to this rule there is only one case in which accent and quantity *must* coincide, and that is in polysyllables, which have the penultimate long: but in polysyllables which have the penultimate short, and in all dissyllables, it is mere accident whether accent and quantity coincide or not. They agree for instance in the words *crīmīnis* and *prāvūs*, but disagree in *pātūlīs*, and *sālūs*. In fact it is this very disagreement which constitutes the harmony of Latin verse, which would be intolerable if accent and quantity always coincided, as any one will find who makes an hexameter consisting of six words, of which the first five are dactyls: whereas those verses are the most harmonious, in which the number of words, where accent and quantity disagree, is equal to the number of those, in which they coincide. For instance in the first line of Virgil's *Bucolics*, which is a very harmonious verse, accent and quantity coincide in *Tityre* and *tegmīne*, but disagree in *recubans* and *patulæ*. The Greeks went on a very different principle from the Latins, in determining the syllable which was to be elevated in speaking*, for in *ἀνθρῶπος* they raised the antepenultimate, in *ἀνθρώπου* the penultimate, &c. But since we have rejected this method, as being attended with some difficulty, and regulate the tone of the voice in Greek, in the same manner as we do in Latin, it follows from what has been said above that we read Greek, neither according to Greek accent, nor according to Greek quantity, but according to the rules of the *Latin* accentuation.

29. Our author is inaccurate, in saying that accents are not found in any manuscript of the Greek Testament written before the eighth century: for both accents and marks of aspiration are found in the following manuscripts in uncial letters, some of which were certainly written before the eighth century; viz. the *Basileensis*,

L 11 2

B. vi.

* In Græcis dictionibus acutus tria loca tenet, ultimum, penultimum, et antepenultimum:—Apud Latinos duo tantum loca tenet, penultimum, et antepenultimum. Diomedes de accentibus, Lib. III. p. 425.

B. vi. 21. Coislinianus 1. Colbertinus 700. Codex Pafionei, Regius 2861. Sangermanensis, Codex Wolfii 1. and the celebrated Codex Vaticanus. For the authorities that these MSS. are written with accents, see the Notes to each of them, ch. viii. sect. 6. There are accents likewise in the Codex Claromontanus, though not a *prima manu*; but Montfaucon (*Palæogr.* p. 217.) says, that they appear to have been added soon after the manuscript was written. The following MSS. in uncial letters, are without accents, Alexandrinus, Augiensis, Cantabrigiensis, Cyprius, Ephrem, and Laudanus 3.

Among other things, which appear in our printed editions, and which were added after the time of the Apostles, may be mentioned the subscriptions at the end of St. Paul's Epistles. These, as they stand in our printed editions, and the common Greek manuscripts, were written by Euthalius. See Wetstein's *Prol.* p. 75. But the Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus have different subscriptions, as appears from Woide's Preface, § 56. and Birch's *Prolegomena*, p. 17.

PAGE 525.

30. The breves and capitula, or, according to their Greek name, the *τιτλοι* and *κεφαλαια*, are frequently called the *τιτλοι* and *κεφαλαια* of Eusebius, not because he invented them, but because he adopted them, and recommended their use.

PAGE 526.

31. Simon, in his *Hist. crit. du texte du N. T.* ch. xxxiii. p. 424. quotes from the Codex Regius 2861. or Codex Stephani η, the following Note, which is written at the end of the manuscript. Τοι κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον εχει τιτλvs ξη, και κεφαλαια τνε. το κατα Μαρκον ευαγγελιον εχει τιτλvs μη, κεφαλαια σλδ. το κατα Λευκαν ευαγγελιον εχει τιτλvs πγ, κεφαλαια τμβ. το κατα Ιωαννην ευαγγελιον εχει τιτλvs ιη, κεφαλαια σλα. These are the divisions, which are found in general in the ancient Greek manuscripts of the

the Gospels. Wetstein. Prol. p. 6. The *τιτλοι*, or larger portions, which amounted to 68. in St. Matthew, 48. in St. Mark, 83. in St. Luke, and 18. in St. John, were so called, because the titles, or subjects of those portions, are written either in the upper, or lower margin of the Greek manuscripts, and generally in red ink; but the *κεφαλαια*, or smaller portions, are numbered in the side margin, without the subjects of those portions being specified. Those who have not access to Greek manuscripts will find both of these divisions very clearly represented, as in the manner above described, in the editions by Erasmus, or in R. Stephens's edition of 1550. But to prevent mistakes, it is necessary to observe that the word *κεφαλαιον* is used in a two-fold sense, and is frequently applied to denote the larger portions, which are otherwise called *τιτλοι*. In this manner it is used by R. Stephens and Küster, in the indexes prefixed to the four Gospels, in their editions of the Greek Testament. The larger portions are likewise called *κεφαλαια* by Theophylact, and some other fathers, as appears from Mill's Note to Matth. xxviii. 20.; Epiphanius on the contrary applies it to the smaller portions, and this seems to be the most ancient application. See Wetstein's Note to Mark xvi. 8. and Simon Hist. crit. du texte du N. T. p. 427. Even in the same manuscript (the above-quoted Codex Regius 2861.) though the smaller portions are called *κεφαλαια* in the Note at the end of the manuscript, yet in the account, which is given at the beginning of the manuscript, the larger portions are called *κεφαλαια*. See Simon Hist. crit. du texte du N. T. p. 425. On the other hand the smaller portions, into which the Gospels were divided, are very generally called the Ammonian sections, from the name of the inventor. See Mill's Prolegomena, §. 658—666.

To these Ammonian sections Eusebius adapted his ten tables, or canons, which represent a harmony of the Gospels, and which were commonly prefixed to the Greek manuscripts. The first of these tables consists of four parallel columns, in each of which are marked the letters,

letters, which denote the sections of each of the four Evangelists; and these letters are so arranged, that the sections containing parallel passages in all the four Evangelists, appear in the same line. In the same manner the 2d. 3d. and 4th. tables represent such parallel passages as are common to only three of the Evangelists; the 5th. 6th. 7th. 8th. and 9th. tables represent such as are common to only two of them; lastly, the 10th. table represents such passages as are peculiar to each. And to enable the reader to refer, not only from the tables to the passages in the Gospels, but likewise from any passage in one Gospel to such as were parallel to it in another, he wrote in the margin of the Gospels, under each of the letters expressive of the Ammonian sections, the letter which denoted the table, where that section was to be sought. For instance, if we wish to find all the parallel passages to *Καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησὺς*, &c. which is the beginning of the section *ιδ* in St. Matthew's Gospel, and corresponds to Matth. iii. 16. according to the modern division, we must observe the letter which is written under *ιδ*, which in the present instance is *α*. This denotes that the first table is the place, where the section *ιδ* must be sought: and on turning to this table we find that in the same line with the section *ιδ* of St. Matthew, we find *ε* for St. Mark, *ιγ* for St. Luke, and *ιε* for St. John. These therefore are the sections in which the parallel passages to *Καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησὺς*, &c. must be sought in the other three Gospels. These tables, with the references to them, may be seen in the editions published by Erasmus, in that of R. Stephens of 1550, or in Küster's edition of Mill's Greek Testament. From these tables of Eusebius the marginal references were taken, that are found in many of our printed editions. But useful as these tables have been, they have had their inconvenience, for they have given rise to marginal annotations in the Greek manuscripts, by which means passages from one Gospel have been mixed with those of another. See Mill's Prolegomena, § 738—744.

32. The Acts of the Apostles, and the catholic epistles, were divided into those chapters, which we commonly find in the Greek manuscripts, by Euthalius, in the fifth century. Euthalius likewise published an edition of St. Paul's epistles divided into chapters, which division had been already made by some other person in the year 396. See Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 74. where may be likewise seen a catalogue of the chapters, into which the Acts and the Epistles are divided in the Greek manuscripts. These chapters are denoted in the Greek manuscripts by letters written in the margin; and they are represented in Stephens's edition of 1550, and Küster's edition of Mill's Greek Testament. Our author says that the chapters, into which the epistles of St. Paul are divided, are continued in one series through them all, because they were considered as one book. It is true that this is the case with the Codex Vaticanus, as appears from Birch's Prolegomena, p. 18, 19. and perhaps this method was observed in many other very ancient manuscripts. On the other hand I have seen Greek MSS. in which a fresh numeration commences at the beginning of each epistle; that for instance marked in the University Library of Cambridge Mm. 6. 9.: and in the celebrated edition by R. Stephens, who must have been guided by some authority, the same arrangement is observed. Wetstein likewise in his Prol. p. 74. quotes a passage from Euthalius, where, speaking of St. Paul's epistles, he says, καὶ ἑκάστην ἐπιστολὴν προτάξομεν τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκθεσιν.

Beside the chapters and sections above-mentioned, many manuscripts of the Greek Testament, the Codex Bezae for instance, are divided into lessons, which are called *αναγνώσματα* or *αναγνώσεις*. A catalogue of them, according to the arrangement of Euthalius, may be seen in Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 75. Some MSS. have these lessons marked in the margin by the word *αναγνώσμα* being written at the beginning of the lesson, or the beginning and end of the lesson is denoted by the words *ἄρχη* and *τέλος*. It is thus in the Codex Bezae. I have seen other manuscripts in which the Sunday is marked at the beginning of each lesson, which is to be read

read on that day, by the word *σαββατον*, with a number annexed to it, thus CA. Γ, CA. Δ, &c.

33. Hugo de S. Caro, or, according to his French name, Hugues de St. Cher, was born, as Moreri relates, at Vienne in Dauphiné, studied at Paris, where he became a Dominican friar in 1225, and died in 1263. The inventor therefore of our modern chapters lived, not in the twelfth, as our author has written by mistake, but in the thirteenth century. These chapters were soon adopted in the manuscripts of the Latin version; but the Greeks still continued to adhere to their ancient *τιτλοι* and *κεφαλαια*, nor are any Greek manuscripts known, in which these divisions are found prior to the fifteenth century, when the Greek fugitives, after the taking of Constantinople, fled into the West of Europe, became transcribers for members of the Latin church, and of course adopted the Latin divisions. The Codex Montfortianus is written in this manner, and likewise a manuscript in the University at Cambridge marked Ll. 2. 13. which, as appears from the subscription, was written at Paris, by George Jerom of Sparta, who died in the beginning of the sixteenth century.

34. These subdivisions of the modern chapters may be seen in R. Stephens's edition of 1550, in the same margin, in which the modern chapters are marked. By this arrangement the chapters are divided into nearly equal portions, which vary in number from four to seven, according to the size of the chapters.

35. I have never been able to procure this dissertation of Rogall, but if he describes these lines as commas, he probably means what Montfaucon says in his *Palæographia*, p. 30. *Hæc vero scriptio συχρως ducta, quæ item per κωλα et κομματια facta dicitur.* And again, p. 31. *Ante Aristophanem Byzantinum hoc uno distinctionis genere in libris usos esse veteres putatur, scilicet per συχρς, per κωλα, per κομματια a linea semper resumebant: et hæc una pausæ nota erat, cum scriptio nempe desinere, antequam interpunctionis usus excogitatus esset.* According to Montfaucon then this method of writing

in *σιχοι* was the only method, before the invention of points, of marking the divisions of the sense. The Codex Claromontanus is written according to Montfaucon in these *σιχοι*, of which he gives the following specimen in his *Palæographia*, p. 217.

Δια την ασθενειαν
της σαρκος υμων.
ωσπερ γαρ παρησησατε
τα μελη υμων
δελα τη ακαθαρσια,
και τη ανομια εις την ανομιαν
ουτω νυν παρησησατε
τα μελη υμων
δελα τη δικαιοσυνη,
εις αγιασμον.

This method of writing is called not only by Montfaucon, but by most other authors writing in *σιχοι*. See Wettstein's N. T. Vol. II. p. 6. and Mill's Prolegomena, § 1035. Our author on the contrary asserts that the *σιχοι* were lines, which contained a certain number of letters, and therefore often brake off in the middle of a word. But according to this sense, the *σιχοι* must have been all of the same length, in the same manner, as the lines in our modern printed books. Now this method of writing is not what is usually called 'scriptio *σιχηως ducta*.' And what Montfaucon and other writers call *σιχοι* our author calls *ρηματα*. For this distinction, and this explanation, he has probably no other ground, than the following passage in Simon Hist. critique du texte du N. T. p. 423. Ou doit donc entendre par le mot de *ρηματα* le nombre des sentences; et par celui de *σιχος* les anciens versets qui étoient mesurés selon les lignes, ou quelque autre sorte de versets. This passage by no means warrants our author's opinion. For Simon does not understand by the word *ρημα* a line, but a portion of words forming some sense, similar to that which the ancients called *κομμα*, whether in the same line, or not. And by *σιχος* he understands a line, not, as our author

means, consisting of a given number of letters, but in the sense probably in which it is generally used.

36. Our author should have called these divisions, not *σηματα*, but *σιχοι*. The latter name is expressly applied to them by Wettstein, Vol. II. p. 6. and the former name is not given them by Simon in the place to which our author refers.

PAGE 528.

37. It does not appear that a numeration of the *σιχοι* was a numeration of the letters, for the *σιχοι* consisted of a very unequal number of letters, as appears from the manuscripts which are written in these lines, such as the Cod. Cantabrigiensis, Claromontanus, Sangermanensis, &c.

38. The same arrangement has been adopted by Wettstein, Griesbach, Bowyer, and other editors, in imitation of the early editions of the Greek Testament printed before the time of Beza, who split the Greek text into the verses invented by Robert Stephens.

END OF VOL. II. PART II.

Princeton Theological Seminary Library

1 1012 01210 8744

Date Due

[illegible]



